















THE  
BC  
AMERICAN  
CATHOLIC QUARTERLY  
REVIEW.

---

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem.

S. AUG. EPIST. CCXXXVIII. AD PASCENT.

---

VOLUME XVI.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1891.

---

PHILADELPHIA:  
HARDY & MAHONY,  
PUBLISHERS AND PROPRIETORS,  
505 CHESTNUT STREET.



---

COPYRIGHT, 1891,

BY

HARDY & MAHONY.

---

70749



# THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

---

VOL. XVI.—JANUARY, 1891.—No. 1.

---

## THE CHRISTIAN AGNOSTIC AND THE CHRISTIAN GNOSTIC.

THE term Agnostic has been very much used of late. The form of the word, by adding the *A* privative to *Gnostic*, shows that it is a negative term. An A-gnostic is one who is not a Gnostic. A *Gnostic* is one professing to have *Gnosis*. This is a Greek word meaning knowledge. The use of the terms *Gnosis* and *Gnostic* is restricted to knowledge of the deepest and highest causes of being, and to that class of persons who profess to have this knowledge.

The *Agnostic* professes ignorance of these deepest causes, namely, of First and Final Cause, of the origin and end of the universe, particularly of this world, and of the beings contained in what is called, in a wide and general sense, Nature. This is not merely an accidental ignorance, or the ignorance of some men concerning some things which can be known and are known by other men. For instance, one who is ignorant of mathematics or Greek is not thereby called an Agnostic. The ignorance must be universal and necessary, arising from the nature of that which is unknown, and from the nature of the human mind. The Agnostic professes that he cannot know, that no man can know that, in respect to which he is an Agnostic. That is to say, there is an *unknowable*, in respect to which the profession of knowledge is a mere pretence. This unknowable, in the language of agnosticism, is origin and end, or First Cause and Final Cause. The Christian philosopher is first, and before all, a Theist. That is, his funda-



mental thesis and doctrine, underlying his entire philosophy, theology, and ethics, is: That God is the First and Final Cause, the origin and the end of all being. The Agnostic affirms that God is unknowable. To be a Christian Agnostic one must affirm the same thing, in some sense. That is, he must say that God, the First and Final Cause, is, in His essence, unknowable to the human mind, by reason of the nature of the human mind which is destitute of a faculty by which it does or can know God, as its direct and immediate object. Does this mean that he has no kind of actual or possible knowledge of God? Certainly not; for he is a Christian Theist. It means only to deny the possibility of a certain kind of *Gnosis* or knowledge.

The Agnostic pure and simple cannot deny some sort of notion of the unknowable. If he had not the notion, he could not have the word. He does not assert positively that what he calls the unknowable has no real existence. He only says that we cannot know that it exists, or, if it exists, what it is. He neither affirms nor denies. But what is the object in regard to which he professes ignorance? How does he know that it cannot be affirmed or denied? He must have the notions of First and Final Cause in order to be able to argue about them, to make any mental act in respect to them, to doubt or to deny their reality.

The Christian Agnostic, for a much stronger reason, when he affirms that there is in God the Unknowable, must say this and think it by reason of something which is knowable, and known, in respect to the origin and end of nature, of first cause and final cause, of God as the author of nature.

The unknowable is what is called in theology the *supernatural*. It is above and beyond all nature; it transcends the scope, therefore, of the human intellect, which is itself a part of nature, and cannot have any operation or any end transcending nature; unless it is raised up into a supernatural order.

Christianity is a supernatural religion. It is founded upon faith in a supernatural revelation. The Christian Agnostic, therefore, by the unknowable in God, intends the unknowable by the mere unaided light of natural intelligence and reason. He intends that ideal object which is disclosed only by revelation.

We can now explain what is the object and scope of the present article. Its object is the supernatural order, in which man is elevated from the purely human plane of being and operation to the divine. Its scope is the presentation of the true idea of the supernatural.

A sublime and difficult work, indeed, it is, to soar into such a region of thought, to ascend above the stars, above the highest heaven of rational philosophy, to that super-celestial domain which



is beyond the ken of any human intelligence, unless enlightened by the rays which come from the light inaccessible in which God dwells.

The true idea of the supernatural order is the one and only key to open the door through which we can point our telescope upon that cluster of mysteries and problems concerning the ways of God toward man, and the relations of man toward God, with which the minds and hearts of so many are busy, and by which they are so much perplexed. It cannot be found anywhere except in Catholic theology. We can remember when first we discovered it, and what a flood of light it poured upon the darkest parts of the Christian creed, such as the origin and reason of evil, the original destination of man, the fall and original sin, human probation, the two contrary final states of rational beings, and similar topics.

The only metaphysical and logical theology to be found among Christians separated from the Catholic Church is the one taught by John Calvin and Jonathan Edwards. This system is incredible. The milder and more humane form of doctrine, which is more generally prevalent, is obscure, indefinite and unsatisfactory. In consequence of the exaggerations and shortcomings of all these imperfect theologies, there is a perpetual unrest, a continual vacillation and change, an unceasing but fruitless endeavor to come to a better understanding of what the Christian religion really is. The striving is after a true conception of the supernatural and divine; a correct understanding of the relations which the natural and human bear to it; a reconciliation between the actual condition of the world and mankind, with its moral and physical evils, and the wisdom, power, goodness and benevolence of God. It is a striving after the true *Gnosis*; to become Christian *Gnostics*. What this *Gnosis* is, and how one becomes a Christian Gnostic, will be considered later on. The topic under immediate consideration is the Christian *Agnostic*. For the present, therefore, we must go back to the discussion of the sense of the proposition: that God is the *Unknowable*: as a proposition of Christian philosophy.

The sense of the proposition is, that the essence of God is invisible and unknowable to the created intellect in its natural state, endowed with only its natural faculty of intelligence, by any act of direct and immediate intuition.

It is necessary, before giving a positive explanation and proof of this statement, to make some preliminary observations on knowledge and the knowable in general.

What, then, is cognition in its most universal sense? We know what it is practically and by experience. We are conscious of having sensitive cognition. We see objects, we hear sounds, we feel by touch material, extended things. So also do irrational ani-

mals. We have also a cognition of immaterial objects, of abstract truths, of self-evident and primary principles, of conclusions drawn from premises by reasoning. We have a cognition of our own acts and of ourselves as suffering impressions from without and originating acts from within, as existing continuously and identical with ourselves in the present and the remembered past.

But how shall we define and describe our cognition and our self-consciousness? What is there plainer, clearer, better known by which we can understand and define what is so immediately evident? There is nothing except consciousness, sensation, thought and knowledge, by which we can understand and explain what these phenomena are. We can, however, by reflection and analysis, gain a more distinct notion of that which we mean by cognition, whether sensitive or intellectual, and by self-consciousness.

Let us compare a sensitive being with one which has no sensitive life. How can we express the difference? We cannot define precisely what the vital principle is. We perceive, however, that the not-living being, water, air, rock, merely exists in and by itself; is acted on and acts in a purely mechanical way. The plant does more. It germinates and grows, produces flowers and fruits, and propagates its kind. There is some mysterious principle, called the *vital* principle, at work, producing a kind of being much better than the aggregations of dead, inorganic matter. Still, there is no sign of a reflection or turning back of the plant upon itself; no sign of sensation; no sign of the feeling of the existence of other things around it, of its own existence; no manifestation of desire, pleasure, pain, or any semblance of consciousness.

The animal has all that is in the plant, and more. It has sensation, and is aware of feeling impressions from other objects. It thus returns on itself, and has a kind of consciousness. Its life is enjoyable. It is moved to act by pleasure, pain, desire, appetites and impulses which are felt. The rational human spirit returns on itself by a perfect return. It is united with an animal organism, and in conjunction with it has sensations and all the operations of animal life.

But it has more. It has a life and operation which are super-organic. It has intellect and reason, knowledge of immaterial objects, a reflex consciousness of its own spiritual operations, and of itself as the subject and principle of its acts.

If we analyze all these acts of sensitive and intellectual cognition, we find that sense and intellect receive into themselves the objects of which they take cognizance. The landscape and the starry heavens are received into our faculty of vision; the music of the band or the choir is received into our faculty of hearing. Truths and ideas are in our minds. Our soul contains the world.



They do not enter into us by their physical being. They come ideally, by certain images, as objects are reflected in a mirror.

So, then, the objects of our knowledge must be proportioned and accommodated to the nature and faculties by which they are received. We cannot see with our ears or hear with our eyes. We cannot plane boards with our memory, or feel a poetic sentiment with our fingers. No nature or faculty can go out of its limits or diverge from its own line. Inorganic bodies cannot share the phenomena of life. Plants cannot have sensation. Those beings which have the faculty of cognition have it according to their own specific nature. Sensible cognition is the apprehension of single, concrete, sensible phenomena, and through the phenomena of the sensible objects. The intellectual cognition of man is the apprehension, in the sensible object, of its immaterial and universal contents; species, genus, substance, number, quantity, truth, beauty, goodness, being, relation of cause and effect, etc. The cognition of the intellectual being who is pure spirit is of spiritual substances, and of truth in its pure essence, free from the sensible envelope.

Let us return now to the notion of cognition as the reception into the being who has the faculty of cognition, of the objects which he apprehends, not according to the mode of being in the received, but according to the mode of the receiver. It is plain that the faculty of receiving is limited by its nature. The sensitive, organic faculty, limited by the nature of bodily organs, can receive only single, sensible objects, but not those which are immaterial. The human intellect, being the faculty of a spirit substantially united to an organic, animal body, can receive only those immaterial objects which it perceives in the sensible, or through the universal ideas which it apprehends by means of the sensible images presented to it by the faculties of sense which minister to its intellectual operation. We cannot see our own souls directly as we see our bodies, or see spirits, or receive ideas into our intellect before we have received sensible images as the starting-point of intellectual operation. The purely intellectual being cannot receive that which transcends the measure of his nature and capacity. Every created being is finite. His capacity is finite. He has received his being from God, and his nature is only in proportion to other created beings which are finite, and have only a being received from the Creator.

It is plain from all this that the creature cannot have a natural capacity for receiving ideally into himself the essence of God. This reception is the same thing with cognition. The creature cannot, therefore, have the direct, immediate cognition, the intuition, the vision of the Divine essence. For the essence of God is infinite. It is not received, but self-existent; it is incompre-

hensible ; it is light inaccessible. As well might you attempt to make an adequate image of the Atlantic Ocean in a dressing-room mirror as to imagine that the largest and clearest created intellect could reflect the being of God as He is in Himself, and as He is known to Himself. The intellectual mirror can receive the image of every being equal or inferior to itself in a manner proportioned to the excellence of its own nature. Even those which are superior to it, if they are finite, are equal to it in a certain sense, since all created things have in common a being which has been received. Being, in all its latitude, is the adequate object of intelligence. Its essence is intelligible to every intellect when duly presented to it and brought within its range.

But the essence of God is beyond its range. And this is what the Christian agnostic means by saying that God is the unknowable. No man and no spirit hath seen or can see God so long as he remains within the limit of the nature which he has received by the act which has created him an intelligent being. He is a part of the universal nature which has received a participated and finite being from God. His range of vision and knowledge is within the limit of this universe. He may go on increasing in knowledge for all eternity, but he can never develop from the principles of intelligence implanted in his nature into that proportion to an infinite object which will enable him to contemplate God directly.

To return to our first proposition. In the natural order, God is the Unknowable. The natural order is that state, constitution and arrangement of the universe and all the beings contained in it, which places them in their due relation to their first and final cause and in harmony with each other. Every one has its own specific nature and endowments, its proper qualities and operations, received from the First Cause, sustained and directed by it. Each one and all together have a place, a purpose, an end, that is, a Final Cause, which are for all the reason of their being.

The intellectual and rational creation is by far the highest and noblest part of the universe. Its end is the highest possible natural end, and is attained in the best, the most elevated, the most excellent manner, *i.e.*, in an intelligent and voluntary manner, by a conscious understanding and desire of the highest object, the most perfect good, and a spontaneous movement towards it.

Beings of this order, whatever inferior elements may enter into their nature, are chiefly intellectual. They find their chief and ultimate object, their final perfection, their supreme happiness, their last end in the Knowable.

To the Unknowable they cannot attain, and therefore they do not aspire to it ; for there is no desire or aspiration which is vain



and fruitless in nature. It cannot be, therefore, that the immediate intuition or vision of God as He is in His divine essence is the natural destiny and end of intellectual creatures. They have no right to it, no capacity for it, no possibility of even initiating a movement toward a region of being and beatitude, which is altogether above the plane of their existence and activity. One might as well attempt to swim the Atlantic Ocean or to go in a balloon to Arcturus, as to soar up into the region of the immediate contemplation of God by the exercise of any natural power which he possesses.

But yet the Christian Agnostic, while denying the possibility of a natural Gnosis of this sublime sort, acknowledges that there is an inferior and properly human mode of knowing the deepest causes, the origin and the end of things, the Creator and Sovereign of the universe, the relations of creatures to their Lord. That is, there is a science of philosophy and theology, which is purely natural.

God is knowable in an indirect and mediate way through the image and representation of Himself which He has made in the creation, and especially in those intellectual and rational natures which He has created after His own likeness.

We are now prepared to state what is meant by the purely natural order in a clearer and more distinct manner.

It is the order which reduces to unity of plan the whole and all the parts of the universe as created by God in certain determinate essences, in a certain determinate extent and quantity and grade of being, with a destination to a certain fixed final end, towards which all things are directed by the harmonious actions of second causes, and by laws proportioned to the nature of the existing creatures and the end prefixed to the universe.

In this natural order, the laws which govern intellectual and rational beings are those which regulate their action and movement, toward their proper perfection on the line of intelligence and virtue; toward the attainment of their ultimate degree of excellence and felicity.

This felicity consists in the knowledge of the true and the good so far as it is knowable, and complacency of the will in this object of knowledge.

This object of knowledge is co-extensive with being, in so far as being is brought within the scope of intellect and presented to its contemplation. All nature, all the universe, and all its parts are within the scope of the power of intellect, of its capacity of knowing and understanding. This capacity can be brought into actual exercise indefinitely without any limits except the bounds of the universe. Such is the wide range of created intelligence.

It is co-extensive with nature. It has the capacity of receiv-

ing ideally whatever does not transcend its nature and measure, the universal truth, goodness and beauty which are in the creation.

The human mind, which in our present state of being on this earth is only an inchoate intelligence, is in the lowest stage of development, and is bound to a sensitive, organic, corporeal mode of being and operation, has only the beginning and the imperfect possession of this natural knowledge and felicity. It is in a state of transit and on the way to its ultimate destination. It has glimpses and glimmerings only of its connatural object of contemplation and love. By these glimpses and glimmerings we can get some faint, inadequate conception of what the human mind is destined to become in its perfect state, of what purely intellectual beings are, and of what the adequate object is, of intelligence and will, according to their nature and intrinsic potency.

We are now prepared to consider how far and in what way God, who is directly and immediately unknowable to the created intellect according to its natural capacity, is indirectly and mediately the object of natural knowledge and natural love. In so far as the apprehension and knowledge of God is contained in the knowledge of the creation, as the First Cause of all finite, contingent effects and their sufficient reason; as the source and origin of all being, truth, goodness and beauty; and as Final Cause; thus far God is knowable by the light of nature, and is known to minds duly educated and in a state of rectitude.

God has made the universe to disclose His existence and perfections as First and Final Cause, in the effects of His efficient causality. He has made it an expression of His own eternal ideas. The human mind, although it makes sensitive cognition its starting point, is not confined to it. It looks into the sensible objects of nature with an intelligent perception by the aid of an intellectual light. It perceives in them necessary and eternal truths. It perceives the principle of causality by intuition; in the effects of infinite wisdom and power, it perceives by reasoning the existence of the first cause; it perceives the true, the good and the beautiful in nature, and by reasoning ascends to the contemplation of the One who is being, truth, goodness, beauty in His essence. In the eternal and necessary truths it perceives by reasoning the infinite intelligence in whom they have their seat and origin. In the laws of the universe it perceives the Lawgiver. In conscience it recognizes the Sovereign Lord to whom the rational creature is accountable. This is the highest rational philosophy. It is natural theology, which is based on self-evident truths and constructed by the deductions of pure reason.

When we regard great works of science and art, we become acquainted through them with the great philosophers, mathema-



ticians, architects, poets, sculptors, painters and musicians, who were the authors of these wonderful works, although we have never seen them. The subject of a kingdom knows the existence and power of his sovereign, though he has never seen him, by the laws, the political order, the exercise of sovereign power, which he sees around him, and amid which he lives. In the same way we know the great architect, poet, sovereign and lawgiver of the universe in the seas and mountains, in the sun and stars, in the flowers and landscapes, in the music of nature, in the moral order of human society, in the movement of history, in the aspiration after universal truth and a supreme felicity. Through the knowledge of nature we know its author; by means of the creation we know God in the mode and degree proportioned to our capacity. The will naturally follows the intellect, and loves the object proposed by the intellect as good. Consequently, the inclination to love God supremely naturally follows upon the knowledge of God as the supreme good.

What has been said of human nature specifically, must be true of all intellectual or rational nature generically. That is, each intellectual species, according to its nature and mode, is made perfect by the knowledge and love of God as known through the creation.

The natural end and destination of intelligent beings, their supreme felicity, consists in the attainment of their due perfection, which is chiefly the perfection of their intellectual faculty and of their knowledge.

This natural destiny, in the natural order, is the contemplation of God and the love of God as made known by the natural light of intelligence and reason, mediately through the universe which He has created. This is the summit of being attainable by the complete development of intelligent creatures.

Their highest felicity, when they have reached their ultimate perfection, is in the loving contemplation of God, and in the security from all liability to sin and the loss of their supreme good. Their perfect and happy state includes also the good which can be enjoyed from all other sources, *i.e.*, from all created objects in the universe.

Even when this ultimate and perpetual\* state of perfection and felicity has been attained, God is still the Unknowable in the sense we have already explained. Suppose all nature to suffer an eclipse, and to become invisible to these exalted intelligences so that they see no created thing, not even themselves. All acts of intellect and will would be suspended. There would be no self-consciousness. They would not see God in this oblivion of the world and themselves. For they have no direct and immediate cognition of

God. They can see Him only as we can see the sun when it is below the horizon, reflected from the clouds of sun-rising and sun-setting, from the moon and the planets. Shut out this reflected light and they are in total darkness, in an intellectual syncope or sleep.

I have explained the sense in which a Christian Agnostic affirms that God is Unknowable. This affirmation it is which makes him an Agnostic. But he is very different from an Agnostic who is not a Christian. In the first place he is a Theist, and therefore includes natural theology within the circle of philosophical science. In the second place he is a Christian, and therefore believes in a supernatural religion. He professes that there is a supernatural Gnosis, and he is therefore a Christian Gnostic. The meaning of this proposition, and the reconciliation of the apparent opposition of what he affirms as an Agnostic, with that which he professes as a Gnostic, now becomes the topic for our consideration.

After the explanation of the natural order and the natural destiny of intellectual and rational beings in that order, follows the explanation of the supernatural order and the destiny of those intelligent natures which are elevated to that higher order of being.

The term *supernatural* is used in different senses. In general it denotes something above some kind of specific nature, and especially human nature.

In the specific sense of the present discussion it denotes that which is above all created nature, whether actual or possible. Of course, if we speak of the essence and nature of God, there can be nothing above that. In respect to created nature God, and God alone, is by His essence above all nature. In this sense He is a supernatural being. If a creature can be raised to a supernatural plane of existence and operation, it can only be by raising him above his nature to a participation in the divine nature, or by his divinisation. If this elevation can be and actually is effected by the divine power, when it is fully accomplished and the creature reaches his acme, the Unknowable in God is made knowable and known as an object of intuitive, immediate contemplation, followed by a proportionate complacency and love. This is the divine Gnosis and the essence of supernatural beatitude.

The supernatural order is one which is arranged for bringing creatures to this sublime destiny, and subordinating all created nature to the fulfilment of this supreme end and culmination of the universe.

The possibility of such an elevation of the creature could never be known or suspected by the light of nature. Intelligent beings are confined within the finite bounds of nature. To pure reason it



does not appear possible that they should transcend those bounds. They have only *esse receptum*, and its measure is incapable of ideally receiving the *esse irreceptum*, as St. Thomas teaches. The finite cannot receive the infinite. The created intellect cannot directly and immediately see God in and through its ideal mirror.

If it can see God it must be so united with God that it can see God in and through God. It must receive a divinisation by which it is brought within the sphere of the divine being, though not absorbed or losing its substantial identity with its own nature, and its own distinct individuality. Is this possible even to Omnipotence? God alone can know whether it is possible or whether He intends to effect it in any of his creatures. Created beings can only know that this supernatural destiny and order are possible, and that they are really intended and effected by the divine power, through a revelation made to them by God. Before they actually attain to the vision of God and the consciousness of possessing the supreme good, they can only know it by faith in the divine veracity. The Unknowable remains a mystery above reason, not directly intelligible, but apprehended through symbols and analogies, yet credible in a rational manner because of the evidence which God has given, that He truly reveals it.

That which makes a man a Christian is the belief in this divine revelation as made through our Lord Jesus Christ. The Christian is a believer in divine mysteries and their correlated truths on the veracity of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. He is a Gnostic, one having knowledge of divine things, according to a certain mode of knowledge; that is, he has a rational certainty of the grounds of his belief, a certain knowledge of that which is proposed to his belief, and some degree of understanding of the harmony between the truths of faith and the facts and truths of natural, rational science. His Gnosis is inchoate and imperfect so long as he is a wayfarer on the earth. He sees as through a glass, darkly. Perfect vision and knowledge are reserved for the state of future and final beatitude.

Let a person be introduced into a vast and superb hall, its ceiling adorned with brilliant frescoes, its walls covered with masterpieces of the great painters. It is night, and the room is dimly lighted. He has an obscure view of the objects of beauty contained within the hall and longs for the day and the bright sunlight to see them clearly and distinctly. The light of faith is an obscure light, dimly disclosing the revealed mysteries which are invisible to the natural intellect, before the day dawns and the day-star arises to cast a bright light upon the objects of the beatific vision.

The supernatural beatitude, together with the order which is

arranged with reference to it, is a purely gratuitous benefit conferred on creatures by the goodness of God, and not in any way due to them in justice or benevolence. Creation itself is a free and gratuitous communication of being and good to the universe. But, when God determines to create, wisdom and goodness must necessarily give to creatures a destination and an end congruous to their nature, which satisfies their natural exigency. Rational creatures receive with their nature a right to that perfection and beatitude of which they have the capacity and to which they aspire. This is due to their nature, and not gratuitous or a pure grace, in addition to the original free gift of rational nature and immortal existence.

All these rights, exigencies, and aspirations are fully satisfied in the natural order. God might not only in justice, but in benevolence and wisdom, leave them eternally in this state of pure nature. They have in their nature no intrinsic capacity, exigency or aspiration for the supernatural elevation to this higher and divine plane. It is, therefore, absolutely gratuitous; it is a pure grace, and if given, may be given to as few or as many as God pleases to favor in this special manner, and on any conditions not impairing any natural right, which He may, according to his sovereign will, see fit to appoint.

It is Christian doctrine that God has actually introduced this supernatural order into the universe, and constituted all angels and the human race in that inchoate, initial state of grace, the consummation of which is celestial glory and beatitude.

The culmination of this order of being is in the Incarnation. Jesus Christ is not only the author and finisher of the Christian faith, He is also its primary and immediate object. To be a Christian is in sum, to believe in Christ. The Christian has his eye fixed in the contemplation of "Him first, Him last, Him midst, and without end." The Incarnation, as a mystery of faith, presupposes and depends from that other sublime mystery of revelation, the Trinity. God, the One in essence, subsists with all His divine perfection in Three Persons. The Second Person, the Son, has assumed a perfect human nature into a union with His divine nature, so intimate that he is one Person in two distinct natures. He is man as well as God. The Creator of the universe was conceived and born of the Virgin. Jesus, the son of Mary, of David, of Adam, is strictly and properly God. This is the divinisation of humanity in the highest sense. The uncreated nature and a created nature are joined in one personality. A finite human nature is taken into the inmost circle of the Godhead. God and man are made one. The same person is both the Son of God and the Son of Man, consubstantial with God the Father, and with the Virgin



Mary. The Incarnation is the masterpiece of divine wisdom, the ultimatum of divine power. It is divine goodness and love, carried to the utmost limit of possibility. God cannot condescend any lower, humanity and created nature cannot ascend any higher. God descended to the lowest level of his creation, the corporeal and material, by assuming a nature one of whose components is material body. Man, in body as well as in soul, ascended to the highest level of being, to the Godhead. Spirit, intellect, reason, sensation, vegetative life, organic structure, and the elements of inorganic matter, were all contained in the human nature of Jesus Christ, which is a microcosm, a complex union of all the distinct, specific essences of the universe. Thus, the universal creation, in its representative, a perfect specimen of the whole, was united to the divine nature, and the creation which proceeded from God as its first efficient cause, returned to Him again as its final cause, making His extrinsic glory to correspond as far as possible to His intrinsic glory.

It is the doctrine of Pantheism that God is everything and everything is God. The All-God is the imaginary being of Pantheistic worship. This is an absurdity and a contradiction. It destroys the nature of God, and the nature of all created beings, blending all into one confused and impossible monster, which is being and no being, infinite and finite, ever becoming and never reaching real fulness of existence. The Incarnation realizes that intimate presence of God in His creation, that union of created being with the uncreated, infinite Being, of which Pantheism is a travesty. God remains unchanged in His essence and personality. The divine nature is not altered and changed into a human nature. The person who assumes humanity does not become a human person, but remains a divine person. The human essence remains unchanged. The human nature is not changed into the divine nature or blended with it, but remains distinct in its own substance and qualities. The human self-consciousness, intellect, will, and body, all that constitutes or flows from humanity, all human attributes, qualities, and perfections, are there in their sum total, as completely as they are in any merely human person. They do not result in a distinct and human personality, because the human nature is taken up and appropriated by a divine Person, who makes it His own, and thus becomes Man without ceasing to be God. This human nature is a microcosm, containing every kind of created being, from matter to spirit, in its composite essence. In this mysterious union of the divine and human natures in the Person of the Son of God and Man, God becomes the All and the All becomes God. The most perfect union is effected between God and His creation, which is

summed up in the masterpiece of His divine wisdom, the humanity of Christ.

In the Incarnation, the supernatural order reaches its summit and apex. The rest of the created universe participates in the elevation of nature to the supernatural in various degrees, in proportion to the relation which different species and individuals in it bear to the Incarnate Son of God.

All the glory which is concentrated in His Person is derived from His character as the only-begotten Son of God the Father. This glory is communicated to His human nature as a natural right. That is to say, although the hypostatic union was a gratuitous gift of grace, which could not be due to a human nature, or merited by human acts, as soon as this human nature was united to the divine nature, the Son of God had a right to endow His human nature with the privileges of the divine Sonship, with the fulness of grace and perfection, the primacy among all created beings, and a participation in divine beatitude.

But He is not simply the *Only Begotten* of the Father; he is also the *First Begotten*, holding the primogeniture among many sons of God who are made sons by adoption, an adoption which is not merely extrinsic, but which is founded on a true *regeneration*. This regeneration gives an intrinsic and inherent mode of being to those who receive it, which elevates their nature to a real likeness with God, and a capacity for being heirs with Christ in His glory and beatitude.

Those pure spirits who are called angels, in their various degrees of intelligence and splendor, have been called to this sublime destination. Men also—the Adamic race—have been called to the same high destiny, and honored above the angels by consanguinity with the Son of God in the same specific nature. All other creatures, all orders of intelligent and rational beings, if there are such in the universe, and all organic and inorganic creatures, the universe, in fine, are subordinated to these, its highest classes, so that the incarnate Son of God rules over all as king, and all are glorified in His glory.

This is the supernatural order; which does not remove the natural order or change the nature of things, but takes it as its basis, erecting upon it the marvellous superstructure of grace, and bringing it back to God as the final cause in the most perfect manner conceivable.

The state, and the highest act of those intelligent beings who have attained their end in supernatural beatitude, is called a state and an act of Gnosis, and those who have attained it are called Gnostics, because the state is intellectual, and the act is an act of intellect. The perfection of an intelligent being is essentially in



his intellect, because intellect is his highest, most God-like endowment. In beatitude he has the immediate intuition, the vision of God as he is in His essence, without any interposing medium. He contemplates the divine being as God contemplates His own divine being, with a complacency which constitutes his supreme felicity, and gives him the fruition of the sovereign good.

We have already seen that to the rational creature, left in his pure nature, God is Unknowable according to this mode of knowledge. And, in the initial state of supernatural grace and life on the earth, this Unknowable object is not apprehended by the clear light of vision, but by faith, which is the evidence of things not seen. It is not visible to the wayfarer who is on the road to the gate of heaven but has not yet passed through it.

Our consciousness assures us that we do not see God, or even see any created spirit immediately, as we see bodies, as we see landscapes, the sun and the stars. If we did, He would appear to us continually from the first instant of conscious existence, surpassing in brightness all created objects more than brilliant sunshine surpasses the light of glow-worms and candles. It would be impossible to doubt His existence, or to err in our conceptions of His attributes, or of His subsistence in Three Persons, or of any of the truths of theology. We are conscious only of perceiving sensible objects and the universal ideas abstracted from them, by which through discursive reasoning we ascend as high in the knowledge and contemplation of spiritual and eternal realities as the limit of our powers will permit. Being, truth, goodness, beauty are knowable in so far as they are manifested in the creation; God is knowable as the first cause, origin, source and archetype, and final cause of all that is revealed in and through the universe that is open to the contemplation of the intellect.

We are perfectly well aware, also, that faith does not give direct and clear *Gnosis* or knowledge of the mysteries of religion believed in by Christians, so that they become evident to the intellect of the believer, even though he be the most enlightened philosopher and theologian. The intellect must receive the light of glory to make it capable of the vision of God and the hidden mysteries of His being. This light is given to those who have attained and are in their eternal, celestial home, but not to wayfarers on the road. Faith which is founded on His veracity gives firm assent to truths revealed by God and leaves the objects obscure.

It is plain that this is the only way in which the Unknowable can be made an object of apprehension and intellectual assent to any intelligent being who has not been raised to the state of beatitude. The angels, in the beginning of their existence, while still on the way and in the state of probation, were capable of illumination

concerning the mysteries of God and their own destination only by a divine revelation proposed to them as an object of faith. They had to gain heaven by faith, believing on the word of God that which was not evident to their natural intelligence. Men are far inferior to angels in intellectual capacity, and therefore in a much more obvious need of receiving by faith a divine revelation as the necessary means of preparing them for a destination similar and equal to that for which the pure spirits of the highest spheres were created.

We remarked at the outset that the correct idea of the supernatural opens the way to a solution of several religious problems about which many minds are perplexed.

The first of these has now come up of itself. It is, namely, the question about the reason and necessity of divine revelation for men. It is asked: Why should not the disclosure which God makes through the universe, through intelligence, through reason, and through human science and history, suffice? This is the suggestion of Theistic rationalists, who would have philosophy and natural theology as taught by sages and men of genius, instead of the Bible and the creeds of the Church, as the guide of mankind toward perfection and happiness in this and in the future world. Accordingly, they reject revelation altogether as a childish imagination, to be cast aside as humanity progresses toward its adult age.

This rationalistic conclusion is derived from premises which are mere assumptions, contradicted by history and evidence.

On the supposition which is the antecedent of all the reasoning of rationalists, viz., that man is in a purely natural order, having a merely natural destiny, the rationalistic conclusion may be allowed to follow logically from its premises. A natural order does not require supernatural means and agencies. Man, in the state of pure nature, would not need an environment and means of development and perfectibility superior to those with which nature furnishes him. Science, art, philosophy, social and political organization, the products of the earth, human industry, the exercise of the rational faculties, would furnish the elements and instruments of civilization, of natural ethics and religion, of progress toward an ideal state of virtue and felicity, and of preparation for transition to a higher state of being in another world.

But if God had actually placed the world and mankind in such an order for such an end, a much better provision for the felicity and development of humanity on this line than the existing one, would have been required by the wisdom and benevolence of God. Men would have known and understood their real condition and



destiny. They would have been satisfied with nature, and would never have dreamed of the supernatural.

History proves that purely rational and natural means for the perfection and felicity of mankind have always proved inadequate. Their failure proves the need of the supernatural even for the natural and temporal welfare and felicity of mankind. It has been the great source of all the good which has ever been in the world. There has always been, since the beginning of the historic period, the presence and explicit belief of an order above nature, or a reminiscence, an aspiration and a dream of such an order. The supernatural obtrudes itself everywhere into the natural. As Cardinal Newman has said, revelation is an universal and not a particular fact. The assertion that it was otherwise in a pre-historic time is pure conjecture and unworthy of notice. All the monuments and records of the human race testify to the universal belief in the supernatural and the aspiration for it. This can only be accounted for on the principle of causality and the sufficient reason, by referring it to the Creator. As the uniform movement of the earth from west to east proves an original impulse in that direction, intended by the Creator to give the earth its law of revolution on its axis and around the sun, so this uniform direction of humanity toward a supernatural end proves that the Creator has given it that destination.

The necessity of revelation and the sufficient reason for it are obvious as soon as the correct idea of supernatural order and destiny is gained. The actual condition of the human race makes it *morally* necessary, even for the instruction of the mass of mankind in religious and ethical truths, which are knowable by reason. For those which are naturally unknowable it is *absolutely* necessary. Once admit that the unknowable to natural intelligence and the unattainable by natural effort is the real object towards which the human mind and will are intended to take their direction, and the congruity of a supernatural revelation with the entire system of things becomes apparent.

The astronomer needs a telescope because he wishes to view objects in the heavens invisible or only dimly visible to the naked eye.

The mind and heart of man have need to be directed to the contemplation of the heavens which are his destined future home. His future beatitude consists in the vision of God in Unity and Trinity and in the Second Person of the Trinity united by the hypostatic union to the humanity of Jesus Christ. This sublime, infinite object of contemplation is the Unknowable to natural reason. But those who are destined to see God with a clear, intuitive vision ought to make acquaintance with the mysteries of

His being while they are on the way, by an initial and obscure knowledge, that they may have the desire and hope of their future beatitude, and may walk in the way which leads to it. Those who will be Gnostics hereafter in reality ought to be Gnostics here in faith and hope, in desire and aspiration. Nothing can be willed unless it is first known. Of the unknown there is no desire; much more of the unknowable. The reason why we must believe in the Trinity, the Incarnation, the supernatural order, the divine beatitude of the future life is, that we are bound to strive after the possession of the sovereign good in God in this order by living a supernatural life and by doing its acts. The root and vital principle of this life is faith. This faith cannot reasonably rest on any ground except the veracity of God, the essential truth in being, in knowing and in manifesting Himself. The intellect cannot come into contact with this Divine Truth, except by a revelation. This revelation must be made credible by sufficient and certain motives of credibility. The fact of divine revelation and the true meaning of the revelation must be made known in such a way as to exclude all error and all doubt. God is omniscient. Whatever He reveals is the Truth. When He is known to have revealed certain mysteries and other connected truths the conclusion logically follows that all which is revealed is infallibly true and certain and credible on the divine veracity. To believe on this authority is a rational act, and to doubt or disbelieve is irrational and immoral.

Who will say that it is impossible for God to reveal truths which are naturally unknowable to the human intellect? God is omnipotent. He is the Creator and the sovereign lord of the beings whom He has created. He can do everything with the human mind which does not imply a contradiction to its nature. Is it a contradiction to the nature of an intellectual creature, and especially to the rational nature of man, that God should raise it to the immediate, intuitive vision of His divine essence, or even to a hypostatic union with the divine nature, as we believe He has done in the Incarnation? How can we know that this is impossible? We cannot, indeed, naturally know that it is possible. If God knows it to be possible, and has determined to effect it, what can make it a contradiction to the nature of our intellect that God should disclose to us the possibility and reality of this divine condescension? Is it true that our intellect is not receptive of these ideas? It is, indeed, impossible that a stone, a tree, or an irrational animal should receive a revelation from God. It is a contradiction to their nature, because their nature is not intellectual and not receptive of anything which is rationally intelligible. But intellect has for its adequate object universal being and universal truth, in so far as that



is presented before it. The Unknowable is naturally Unknowable because, in the natural order, it is not presented to the intellect. But in the supernatural order it is knowable, because God presents Himself immediately before the intellect, and so enhances and intensifies the intellectual capacity that it is able to receive the intimate presence of God, in and through which it can know Him as He is.

The precise question is, whether, in our present state, we can receive an idea of these mysteries, and elicit an act of assent to their truth? That we can is manifest from the fact that we have these ideas in our minds; that we can reflect upon them, reason about them; that some doubt or deny their conformity to objective truth, and that multitudes of persons give an undoubting assent to the objects represented by these ideas. We have an idea of the Trinity, of the Incarnation, of the supernatural order, of the beatific vision. Men can present these ideas before our minds, can discuss them, can affirm their truth, and present the evidence of their credibility.

If men can talk and reason with us about these things, God can. He can speak with his creatures, if He will. He can disclose to them any truth which they are capable of apprehending. He can give them evidence that He has spoken, and certitude of what the word He has spoken truly signifies. Having done so, the fact proves the possibility. *Ab actu ad posse valet consequentia.* The fact of divine revelation, the divine origin of Christianity, are established by a numerous array of *evidences* which are irrefragable. It is certain that God has revealed the mysteries of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the supernatural order of grace, the eternal beatitude of the angels and saints in an ineffable union with God. It is irrational to go behind these evidences of divine revelation, to question the possibility of the supernatural. The only rational procedure, for one who does not already possess but is seeking to find the truth, is to look these evidences in the face; and when convinced, to give assent to the divine revelation; to inquire into its genuine and authentic sense, and to believe firmly what God has revealed. Such an one is the Christian Gnostic. He knows what and why he believes. He assents to its truth on the veracity of God, who knows all things, and has given His word for the truth of all that which the Christian believes, on divine testimony, without immediate evidence of its intrinsic truth.

This is the explanation of the sense of the proposition: That a Christian is both an A-gnostic and a Gnostic; that the unknowable in God is apprehensible and credible by Faith, and will be intuitively known in Vision.

## CHURCH AND STATE.

## I.

SOCIETY as we now find it, and as far back as history reveals it to us, lives and moves, and has hitherto lived and moved, under the influence of the two-fold principle of Church and State. It is not simply the State, nor is it simply the Church, but it is made up of a union of both Church and State.<sup>1</sup> Association for the pursuit of temporal happiness gives rise to the State; association in a community of spiritual goods for the pursuit of eternal happiness gives rise to the Church.<sup>2</sup> Just as a man is not all body nor all soul, but the intimate union of body and soul, even so is society composed of the intimate and inseparable union of a temporal organization and a spiritual informing principle. For what the soul is to the body, religion is to the State. "No State," says Walter, "can subsist without religion, which fills and interpenetrates every sphere of life with the sense of the obligation of duty. Religion, which respects and maintains every right of high and low, of strong and weak, is the conservative element of society. . . . By the strength of character which she forms, she preserves the youth of nations, and when they fall away and decay, keeps them from the withering up of mind and heart. Religion is the groundwork of family life, and of the purity and piety nurtured therein. . . . She brings rich and poor nearer together, urging upon the rich sympathy and active help to the poor, and instilling into the poor gratitude and consolation. Thus she softens every condition of life, and teaches man that he can be elevated and ennobled by submission. Religion, then, is the true bond which holds the State together, makes it strong, and saves it from degeneracy."<sup>3</sup> Now, religion without a Church is a mere abstraction. "The Church is the external manifestation, the realization and the expression of the Christian religion in an independent organism."<sup>4</sup> The early Fathers recognized this intimate union of Church and State. St. Isidor of Pelusium, wrote from his hermitage in Egypt: "The government of the world rests on kinghood and on priesthood; although the two differ widely—for one is as the body, the other as the soul—they are nevertheless destined to one end, the

<sup>1</sup> Brownson's Works, vol. xiii., p. 265.

<sup>2</sup> Cardinal Mazzella, *De Religione et Ecclesia*, p. 449.

<sup>3</sup> *Naturrecht und Politik*, p. 237, Bonn, 1871.

<sup>4</sup> Schema concerning the Church prepared by the Fathers of the Vatican Council, apud Hergenröther, *Church and State*, vol. i., p. 52.



well-being of their subjects.”<sup>1</sup> And St. John Chrysostom boldly carries out the metaphor of soul and body to its limits: “The Church,” he says, “is above the State, in the same way the soul is above the body.”<sup>2</sup>

## II.

Going back to pagan days we find that philosophers never dreamed of separating religion from the State. Plato strives to impress the citizens of his ideal republic with the necessity of keeping the Divine law if they would preserve the State: “God, as the old tradition declares, holding in His hand the beginning, middle and end of all that is, moves, according to His nature, in a straight line towards the accomplishment of His end. Justice always follows Him, and is the punisher of those who fall short of the Divine law. To that law he who would be happy holds fast, and follows it in all humility and order. . . . Wherefore, seeing human things are thus ordered, . . . every man ought to make up his mind that he will be one of the followers of God. Henceforth all citizens must be profoundly convinced that the gods are lords and rulers of all that exists, that all events depend upon their word and will, and that mankind is largely indebted to them.”<sup>3</sup> Aristotle, with less unction, though not with less conviction, pronounces worship to be the first of the six leading administrations without which the State cannot subsist, assigns the first rank to the priesthood, would have special edifices dedicated to worship, and the fourth part of the soil and land devoted to purposes of religion.<sup>4</sup>

The relations of Church and State vary with times and occasions. In the gentile world the Church was absorbed by the State. It was the tool and instrument of the State. The number and nature of the household gods were regulated by the State. The ceremonies connected with the worship of them were enjoined by the State. The titular deities of the State were carefully served; they were to be placated in times of calamity, appealed to for aid in times of war; their ire was to be appeased in the hour of defeat, or they were to receive public thanksgiving in the hour of victory. Every ceremony was legislated for by the State. The ruler was also the Pontifex Maximus. He united in himself the plenitude of civil and priestly power. In all else was the State equally paramount. The family was absorbed in the State. The individual lived for the State, continued to breathe by favor of the State, and died when the State so decreed. The State was the source whence all things drew the breath of life, and the seat of all wisdom and authority.

<sup>1</sup> *Isid. Pelus.*, l., iii., ep. 249.

<sup>2</sup> *Hom.* 15, in 2 Cor., n. 5; *Migne* xi., 509.

<sup>3</sup> *De Legg.*, iv., p. 288.

<sup>4</sup> *Politics*, viii., 8-12.

Such was the condition of things when Christianity first dawned upon the world's horizon, and revealed another order of things. It revealed to man a kingdom other than the kingdoms of this world, to which he had a flawless title. It taught him the value of his immortal soul, redeemed by the blood of Christ. It taught him how to pray and how to overcome his passions. How much there was in this teaching we will let Döllinger explain: "When," he says, "the attention of a thinking heathen was directed to the new religion spreading in the Roman Empire, the first thing to strike him as extraordinary would be, that a religion of prayer was superseding the religion of ceremonies and invocations of gods; that it encouraged all, even the humblest and most uneducated to pray, or, in other words, to meditate and exercise the mind in self-scrutiny and contemplation of God. . . . This region of Christian metaphysics was open even to the mind of one who had no intellectual culture before conversion. In this school of prayer he learned what philosophy had declared to be as necessary as it was difficult, and only attainable by few—to know himself as God knew him. And from that self-knowledge prayer carried him on to self-mastery. If the heathen called upon his gods to gratify his passions, for the Christian tranquility of soul, moderation, and purifying of the affections were at once the preparation and the fruit of prayer. And thus, prayer became a motive-power of moral renewal and inward civilization, to which nothing else could be compared for efficacy."<sup>1</sup> Justin Martyr called attention to this benign influence of Christianity in his day: "We Christians contribute most to the tranquillity of the State, since we teach that God governs all; that the evil-doer, the avaricious, the assassin, as well as the virtuous man are known to Him; that each one who passes out of this life will receive an eternal reward or an eternal punishment according to his deserts. Now, if all believed these truths, assuredly none would continue a moment longer in sin, but all would restrain themselves, and strive to do right, in order finally to obtain the promised reward and to escape punishment. For those who do evil know that they can escape from your laws; but if they had learnt, and were fully convinced, that nothing, not an action, nor even a thought can remain hidden from God, they would, at least from fear of punishment, strive to do right."<sup>2</sup> In this manner did Christianity become a new civilizing element. Now, society is perfect in proportion as the individuals composing society are perfect. But the perfection of the individual consists in submission to the Divine law. "When we

---

<sup>1</sup> *The First Age of the Church*, vol. ii., pp. 216, 217.

<sup>2</sup> *Apol. I., pro Christ* xii.



revere and honor God," says the Angelical Doctor, "our mind is subject to Him, and in this our perfection consists. For everything is perfected by its subjection to that which is above it, as the body when it is vivified by the soul."<sup>1</sup>

### III.

Let us now endeavor to make clear to ourselves the meaning both of Church and of State. We will begin with the Church. The Church is an organism. It is a visible embodiment of Divine influences addressing itself with authority to the souls of men in the name of God and for an eternal and supernatural end. It is the visible custodian of the natural law and the revealed or positive law. It has not created or invented or discovered these laws. They are eternal. The Church could not change them if it would. But every church, be it true or false, speaks to man in the name of Divine authority, and every true member of that Church recognizes the Divine sanction. A church without such sanction and such authority is meaningless. A church on a human basis, promulgating a purely human doctrine, looking no higher than human reason, bears upon it the impress of its own fallible, short-lived nature. It is branded with the seal of imposition. Not the combined genius of a Comte, a Littré and a Frederick Harrison can make the church of positivism other than a religious by-play. Gautama and Mohammed established their doctrines and built up their churches only in the name of God and as His ministers. Had they presented themselves upon a purely human basis they would have passed away unheeded. But they were in earnest; they believed themselves sent of God; therefore, they were accepted for what they represented themselves to be, and accordingly they succeeded. The Protestant synod of Alain, in 1620, excommunicated by virtue of the Divine authority which it conceived to be vested in it: "We, ministers of the gospel of Jesus Christ, whom God hath furnished with spiritual arms . . . to whom the eternal Son of God hath given the power to bind and to loose upon earth, declare that what we shall bind upon earth shall be bound in heaven."<sup>2</sup> The Puritan fathers would not and dare not make laws opposed to the teachings of their church. They recognized its supremacy. Believing that they alone were right and the favored ones of God's providence, they stood out against the whole world and persecuted and outlawed all who presumed to hold religious opinions different from the tenets which they believed to be God's

<sup>1</sup> *Summa Theologiae*, II., ii., qu. xxxi., art. 7.

<sup>2</sup> *Actes eccles. et civiles de tous les Synodes nationaux de l'Eglise reformée de France*, ii., 181, 182.

own teaching. They stood upon an elevated but a very narrow spiritual plane of religious opinion.

Of course, not everybody speaking as the mouthpiece of the Divinity is inspired. Brigham Young made thousands believe that he had a divinely-inspired mission ; few believe in the Divinity of that mission to-day. But we are not here concerned with determining the notes by which true inspiration is to be distinguished from pure illusion and imposition. We are simply calling attention to the fact that every church has meaning only by reason of its Divine origin and the Divine authority in whose name it teaches. We will define the Christian Church as it appears to us in its oldest and most authentic form.

Christ organized the Church. The Apostles were the first bishops. From the beginning was a hierarchy established. Peter was made head of the Church and was recognized as such by his colleagues ; priests and deacons, and the other clerical orders were established. The Church as thus organized is endowed with a three-fold power ; namely, the power to administer the sacraments, the power of jurisdiction and the power of teaching. Of the seven sacraments recognized by the Church as the seven channels instituted by Christ, by which His grace is conveyed to the soul and man is raised up into the sphere of the supernatural, five can be administered by none other than a bishop or priest. Therefore it has been with the most scrupulous care that succession in the orders of bishops and priests has been preserved in the Church from the days of the Apostles. And so the faithful of every period in this visible organism, the Church, have had these seven sacraments and a duly ordained and properly authorized priesthood to administer them.

The Church has a power of jurisdiction, that is to say, she has the right to exercise authority over Christians in those things which belong to religion. This power flows directly from the authority of the Divine Founder. It alone makes licit the sacramental power of the clergy. Indeed, no pastoral act may be performed within the Church without participation in ecclesiastical authority. That authority may be delegated or it may belong to the office for which one has been ordained. But the main point to hold in view is this : That no jot or tittle of ecclesiastical jurisdiction is derived from the laity within the Church or from the State or from any source other than the Divine authority on which the Church is founded. Therefore, wherever there is lay or State interference in the matter of the sacraments, or of doctrine or of religious jurisdiction, there is an element foreign to the Divine institution established by Christ. A Church, for instance, that would be organized and legislated for by Congress could

scarcely command the respect and submission of men. It might, indeed, be a very wise human institution, but no one would dare call its Congressional enactments the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Equally human and equally fallible would be a Church created by act of Parliament.

The jurisdiction of the Church is, then, the jurisdiction of a visible independent organism, and is judicial, legislative and executive. She has the right to make laws within her own spiritual sphere of action, and to execute those laws. She has the right to impose upon her members the obligation of accepting without reserve her declarations concerning faith and morals under ecclesiastical penalties. As the custodian of the natural law and of the revealed law, she is entitled to interpret and administer them in religious matters. She has, moreover, the power to make and to enforce laws of her own. These laws, be it remembered, contain within themselves so much of a purely human element that they may be changed, or dispensed with, or abrogated. Thus it is that in certain countries certain holidays of obligation have been abrogated. Thus it is that the Church daily grants dispensation regarding marriage within certain degrees of kindred. In like manner does she dispense persons from vows or commute their vows under certain circumstances and with sufficient reason. All this she could not do with regard to the Divine law, whether it be natural or positive. She could not, for instance, permit or tolerate an act of injustice as between man and man, nor could she allow her highest dignitaries, any more than her humblest laymen, to injure their neighbor's reputation by any act, overt or covert, direct or indirect; nor in such supposition could she dispense them from making such reparation as is within their power. She cannot change the eternal principle of right and wrong.<sup>1</sup> All these are primary truths.

#### IV.

Next, consider the teaching power of the Church. Her Divine Founder gave her the mission to go forth and teach all nations in His name. *He that heareth you heareth me.* This mission extends to all subjects bearing upon religion. It includes both the natural and the positive law of God, as well as the revealed truths and mysteries of faith. The teaching power resides in its plenitude in the Roman pontiff as it did in his predecessor, the Apostle Peter. He is unerring in defining matters pertaining to faith and

---

<sup>1</sup> "But all theologians and laymen know that the Pope can do nothing against the Divine law; that he cannot dispense from the observance of the Fourth Commandment; that all Papal laws, even if they must be regarded as irreformable, still do not cease to be human,"—CARDINAL HERGENROETHER, *Anti-Janus*, p. 42.



morals. His infallibility does not extend beyond this domain. In all matters of political action or of private opinion the Pope is as liable to err as any layman equally instructed. An ecumenical council is also unerring when defining matters of faith and morals; but it is only the papal approval that renders the council ecumenical and stamps its decrees with the seal of authority. The teaching power is communicated to bishops and priests, but not in its plenitude. They may err in their teachings, even as they may be culpable in their conduct. Their words have authority only in proportion to the accuracy with which they transmit the doctrines of the Church. Personally, the weight of their utterance depends on the learning and the soundness of judgment they bring to bear upon their subject-matter.

And here, we would dwell upon a grave misconception entertained of our mental attitude as Catholics by those not of the body. We give the misconception as stated by an American writer who would not voluntarily do us an injustice. Speaking of the Church in America this writer says: "There is almost as much dissent, agnosticism, free thought—call it what you will—among educated Catholics as among other people in America. This is at once the source of peculiar strength and of unique weakness to the Catholic Church."<sup>1</sup> We do not see how this can be a source of anything real, since it is a condition of things that does not exist outside of the writer's mind. We Catholics—the ignorant layman no less than the learned theologian—all profess the same creed and hold by the same truths of faith, upon the same ground of belief, namely, upon the veracity of God revealing them to us through the Holy Roman Catholic Church. This and nothing more. The learned theologian may attempt to account for the faith that is in him; he may seek to reconcile it with his reason; he may answer objections raised against certain articles of his faith; but he cannot pare away or minimize that faith; he cannot drop a single jot or tittle of that faith without ceasing to be a Catholic. He accepts it all—neither more nor less—with the same sincerity with which his unlettered brother accepts it. The mental attitude of Catholics towards their faith is simply one of absolute certitude. In matters of opinion, or of credence, or of speculation, or of mere probability, we exercise our own judgments like the rest of men on those same matters, and come to our own conclusions according to personal bias and the tone of our intellectual training. Even in matters of faith our explanations of the various articles of our creed may vary and some may even be erroneous. There are men, for instance, who find the presence of design in the material

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Westminster Review*, June, 1888.

world a strong argument for the existence of God; others refuse to be convinced by that argument, but find their strongest demonstration in a recognition of the moral sense. But it is clearly an abuse of terms to call our honest divergence of opinion concerning all matters upon which we are free to diverge, free thinking or agnosticism in the accepted meaning of these words. You cannot conceive a Catholic agnostic. As well might you think a positive negation. One term is as meaningless as the other. You might conceive a minister of the Church, whether priest or bishop, continuing to exercise the functions of his ministry long after he has ceased to believe in their efficacy, but sooner or later he shirks the discipline of his position, and the world takes at his worth the man who sails under false colors or who dares not assume the responsibility of his convictions. Now, it would be a vile slander upon the Catholic priesthood in America—and the writer from whom we have quoted would be the last to put it upon them intentionally—to say that any number of them were praying to a God in whose existence they did not believe, or administering sacraments in whose efficacy they had no faith.

Our Catholic writers are of all shades of opinion upon the issues of the day, and they may be so without incurring ecclesiastical censure. Take, for instance, the burning questions of modern science and modern thought. Some there are who think that as children of the age it is their duty to face the problems of the age and effect their solution as best they may. Others, again, are alarmed at the hostile attitude of certain leaders of modern thought towards the Church, and, identifying the person with the cause, condemn the whole without a fair hearing. They seek refuge in extreme rigidity of doctrine. In their opinion the Decalogue is incomplete, the sermon on the mount too mild, and Rome too lenient. The non-Catholic world is only too prone to identify this class of writers with the Church. Their extreme views bring odium upon religion. They seem incapable of learning from the blunders of the past. They speak and write as though the Inquisition had never made Galileo say that the earth did not move round the sun, or the Sorbonne had not dictated to Buffon what he should write concerning this world's formation. Every educated Catholic knows that neither the Inquisition nor the Sorbonne is the Church, and though both were formidable bodies, they had no claim to infallibility. Why should these over-hasty writers attempt to force a repetition of such blunders? They are misleading, and are not to be considered in any respect representative. You will find other Catholic writers holding views as broad as theirs are narrow. The children of the Church have great liberty of action and opinion. It is the liberty of children in a well-regulated

household. They know the limit beyond which they must not pass.

The doctrinal life of the Church consists in this, that she at all times and under all circumstances preserves unity of doctrine in the midst of multiplicity of opinion. The doctrine she teaches to-day she has always and everywhere and to all men taught from the beginning. This is the secret of her strength and her endurance as a teaching body. Permit me to quote for you an impartial witness to the fact. Speaking of the characteristic of absolute infallibility Mr. Mallock says: "Any supernatural religion that renounces its claim to this, it is clear can profess to be a semi-revelation only. It is a hybrid thing, partly natural and partly supernatural, and it thus practically has all the qualities of a religion that is wholly natural. In so far as it professes to be revealed, it of course professes to be infallible; but if the revealed part be in the first place hard to distinguish, and in the second place hard to understand—if it may mean many things, and many of those things contradictory—it might just as well have been never made at all. To make it in any sense an infallible revelation, or in other words, a revelation at all, *to us*, we need a power to interpret the testament that shall have equal authority with that testament itself. Simple as this truth seems, mankind have been a long time learning it. Indeed, it is only in the present day that its practical meaning has come generally to be recognized. But now, at this moment, upon all sides of us, history is teaching it to us by an example so clearly that we can no longer mistake it. That example is Protestant Christianity, and the condition to which, after three centuries, it is now visibly bringing itself. It is at last beginning to exhibit to us the true results of the denial of infallibility to a religion that professes to be supernatural. We are at last beginning to see in it neither the purifier of a corrupted revelation, nor the corrupter of a pure revelation, but the practical denier of all revelation whatsoever. It is fast evaporating into a mere natural theism, and is thus showing us what, as a governing power, natural theism is. Let us look at England, Europe and America and consider the condition of the entire Protestant world. Religion, it is true, we shall find in it; but it is religion from which not only the supernatural element is disappearing, but in which the natural element is fast becoming nebulous. It is, indeed, growing, as Mr. Leslie Stephen says it is, into a religion of dreams. All its doctrines are growing vague as dreams, and like dreams their outlines are forever changing. . . . There is hardly any conceivable aberration of moral license that has not in some quarter or other embodied itself into a rule of life and claimed to be the proper outcome of Protestant



Christianity."<sup>1</sup> So far Mr. Mallock. His remarks make it clear to us that a church regarding itself as Divine in its origin and inspiration and at the same time not unerring as a guide would be a self contradiction.

But there are limitations to the teaching mission of the Church. The fulfilment of Christ's promise to be with His Church and to guide and direct her in her mission extends only to those things for which she has been commissioned. She has no mission to teach purely secular science. She may utilize the science she finds her children possessed of, and speak to them in the language of that science, but she never descends to take issue upon every new scientific theory. Should science trespass upon her domain and assert anything opposed to her fixed and immutable principles she cautions her children against such teachings. Individual members of the Church may dispute over certain issues, but the Church bides her own time with the patient tranquility of one who has outlived many disputes and seen many brilliant and aggressive theories dashed to spray at her feet. And when science shall have winnowed the chaff from the grain and human reason shall have become possessed of an additional fact or an additional law of nature, the Church shall be found precisely where she stood before the discovery. She is not the one who has been obliged to shift her lines. It is in this attitude of the Church that we have the clue to her whole bearing towards science in the course of its development and its variations.

Here it may be asked: Since the teaching mission of the Church is thus circumscribed, why does she make such persistent efforts to control education in all its roots and branches? To this we would say: The Church cannot recognize any system of training for the child from which religion is excluded. With her religion is an essential factor in education. Among Christian peoples the child has always combined Christian doctrine and Christian practices with purely secular teaching in the school-room. The child of Christian parents is entitled to this Christian education. To impose upon him any system of education calculated to weaken his hold upon the Christian heritage into which he was born, were an act of gross injustice. Our Catholic clergy, as the pastors of souls, answerable to God for those confided to their care, are in duty bound to see that the children of their parish are instructed in the doctrines and practices of that Church which they believe to be the pillar and the ground of Truth. This can be properly and efficiently done only by means of a system of education especially provided for the purpose. Given a clergy believing in the Divine

---

<sup>1</sup> *Is Life Worth Living?* pp. 274, 275.

origin of their religion, believing that religion to be so great a boon that they would gladly die for it, believing that unless the child is at an early age taught religious doctrine and religious practices he runs the risk of growing up wholly indifferent to the priceless value of his Christian heritage, and you cannot conceive that clergy holding any other attitude towards a purely secular education for their Catholic children than one of hostility. It were a betrayal of their trust, an abandonment of the birthright of those confided to them, to acquiesce in a school system from which Catholic doctrine, Catholic prayer, and Catholic practices of devotion had been banished. Therefore it is that the Church binds the consciences of pastors and of people to keep their Catholic children aloof from such schools, and to establish parochial schools whenever and wherever it is possible.

Her mission to teach gives the Church the right to safeguard the child against any influence that would be injurious to faith and morals. Hers is the right to see that the books made use of, the men and women imparting instruction, and the character of the instruction given, be such as aid in the work of spiritualizing and elevating the child, and making his soul worthy of its future heavenly abode. Hers is the duty to forbid to her children the use of books in which there is doctrine contrary to that which she teaches, in which is to be found any system or principle of mental philosophy that she has condemned, or in which history is compiled with a view to misrepresenting Catholicity or undermining Catholic influences. Children, or even young men and young women, are not in position to take in both sides of religious, philosophical or historical questions; they lack maturity of judgment and the information essential to determine truth from error. It were folly to leave their weak, half-trained, ill-informed minds to grapple alone with issues that exercise the most ripened scholars to comparatively little purpose. And so it happens that while the Church has no mission as regards the imparting of purely secular education, it belongs to her function to exercise due vigilance over every branch of science and letters that would be likely, directly or indirectly, to affect religious belief.

## V.

We now come to the State. The State is also a social organism. It grows out of the very nature of society. The family, and not the individual, is the unit of the State. "The human family," says Cardinal Manning, "contains the first principles and laws of authority, obedience, and order. These three conditions of society are of Divine origin; and they are the constructive laws of all civil

or political society.”<sup>1</sup> Therefore, the State is of Divine origin. It is organized for the protection of society and the common weal. It has rights and duties and responsibilities. Its rights are embodied in the natural law, and come not from society, nor from its own intrinsic nature, but from God who is the source and sanction of all authority, obedience and order. The State is organized directly for the happiness and well-being of man in this life. It protects his person and property; it guarantees him liberty of action in the fulfilment of his duties; it frames such laws as promote his welfare and the welfare of the nation. The form of government established in the State is determined by the people. There is no Divine ordinance as to what that form may be. Nor has the Church a preference. If our theologians speak of the king and the kingly form of government, it is because that is the form with which when writing they were most familiar. But the present Pope, Leo XIII., has clearly defined the position of the Church as regards form of government: “While being the guardian of her rights,” he says, “and most careful against encroachment, *the Church has no care what form of government exists in a State, or by what custom the civil order of Christian nations is directed; of the various kinds of government there is none of which she disapproves, so long as religion and moral discipline live untouched.*”<sup>2</sup> But while the form is determined by external circumstances, the authority and the sanction come from God. No man, for instance, has the power of life and death over another; and yet in the interests of society, the State condemns the criminal to be hanged. Whence derives it this dread power? Not from society, for the command *Thou shall not kill* is as applicable to a body of individuals as to a single person. Not in the State itself, for the State is only the society composing it, and society cannot give what it does not possess. The power and the sanction of that power come to the State from God alone. And since the State is of God as well as the Church, complete harmony should exist in all their relations. But the history of modern civilization is the history of unintermitting struggle between Church and State. Whence arises this struggle? The sphere of action of each is distinct. “Both Church and State have each an individual domain; wherefore in fulfilling their separate duties neither is subject to the other within the limits fixed by their boundary lines.”<sup>3</sup> So speaks the reigning pontiff. To understand the struggle we must go back to the origin of Christianity. Christianity found itself face to face with Pagan Rome. Its Divine Founder counselled His disciples to

<sup>1</sup> *The Vatican Decrees in Their Bearing on Civil Allegiance*, p. 46. Am. ed.

<sup>2</sup> Encyclical, January 10, 1890.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*



render unto Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's and to God the things that were God's. And St. Paul threw the whole force of his energetic soul into insistence on obedience to the State. "Let every soul be subject to higher powers; for there is no power but from God; and those that are are ordained of God. Therefore he that resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God and they that resist purchase to themselves damnation. . . . Render therefore to all men their dues. Tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor."<sup>1</sup> But there were clearly defined limitations beyond which the Christian could not submit. He could not worship the false gods of the pagan world. He could not share in the national rites and ceremonies that cloaked the most disgusting orgies and crimes. The Christian had learned the holy nature of the living God, the heinousness of sin and the necessity of keeping his soul spotless before the all-penetrating Presence. He had learned that many pagan practices, sanctioned by religion, were sinful, and he preferred death to sin. This gave rise to a bitter struggle between the State and the early Christian Church. There was no compromise. Under all circumstances God is to be obeyed rather than men. And so the Roman empire reeked with the blood of martyrs. It was a death-struggle. On the one side was the all-powerful, all-absorbing empire of the world, and on the other were a few scattered Christians, weak in numbers, weak in rank and position, weak in every respect but in the moral courage to live up to their convictions. But moral courage, animated by a burning idea, is an irresistible force. The vast material resources of the Roman Empire could not withstand its progress. Rome under Constantine proclaimed herself Christian. Her very law became regenerated.

St. Augustine had said—and his words bore with them great weight throughout the Middle Ages—that true justice has no existence save in that republic whose founder and ruler is Christ.<sup>2</sup> In the light of Christian truth and in the practice of Christian justice, always tempered by Christian mercy, the absolute law of pagan Rome came to be regarded as supreme injustice. Public opinion was gradually educated up to a higher conception of right and equity. Men became impressed with the sanctity of human life. From the beginning the Church had set her face against abortion and infanticide. In the course of time the State imbibed the same horror for these crimes and enacted laws against them. Gladiatorial games, in which lives were cast away to pander to a depraved taste, were abolished. A sense of universal brotherhood

---

<sup>1</sup> Romans xiii., 1-7.

<sup>2</sup> *De Civ. Dei.*, ii., 4.

grew apace. The dignity of labor became recognized. Charity extended a helping hand in many directions to the relief of want and the assuaging of misery and suffering. Immediately after the days of Constantine it is no longer the emperor who is remembered in men's last will and testament; it is the Church as the dispenser of charities. Here is already a great revolution of ideas. But the greatest of all revolutions in Roman jurisprudence is the recognition of the woman's rights in the marriage law as standing upon an equal footing with those of the man. This change renders the Justinian Code an immortal landmark in the history of human progress. The world has ceased to be Roman; the Galilean has conquered.

In like manner did the Church educate the barbarian up to the same sense of the sanctity of human life, the same respect for others' rights and others' goods, and the same idea of a universal brotherhood. In legislating for sin she was legislating for crime. The early Christian kings frequently made the Penitentials the basis of their criminal code. Her bishops and clergy in their councils enacted laws as beneficial to the State as they were helpful to souls. And so almost imperceptibly did modern jurisprudence receive a Christian tone till in its whole substance and meaning it has become solely and peculiarly Christian.<sup>1</sup> Well might Lecky write of the influence of the Church: "She exercised for many centuries an almost absolute empire over the thoughts and actions of mankind and created a civilization which was permeated in every part with ecclesiastical influence."<sup>2</sup> Let us not close our eyes to the nature of that influence. It was an influence achieved only after a long and patient struggle. The Church begins by teaching the barbarian his letters. By means of literature and ritual and ceremonial and plain chant she speaks to his imagination, and he understands and appreciates her language and his nature grows refined beneath the refining influence. By means of prayer and the grace of the sacraments she moulds his character and forms his soul to virtue. Her mission was one of civilization. It was the effort of mind to predominate over matter, the taming of lawless natures, the lifting up into a higher plane of thought, exertion and aspiration, a humanity that had otherwise been content to live within the most circumscribed sphere of earthly existence. An Ambrose stays the footsteps of Theodosius at the Church-door because his hands were stained with wanton bloodshed. This sublime act embodies the spirit and the mission of the Church towards the State. "The resistance,"

<sup>1</sup> See Bluntschli, *Allgemeines Statsrecht*, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> *History of European Morals*, ii. p., 15.

says Bryce, "and final triumph of Athanasius proved that the new society could put forth a power of opinion such as had never been known before; the abasement of Theodosius the emperor before Ambrose the bishop admitted the supremacy of spiritual authority."<sup>1</sup> And so we find the Church at all times and under all circumstances, without respect of persons, regulating conduct and preserving purity of faith and morals.

## VI.

In the midst of this civilizing process there loom up two powers, each the embodiment of a distinct idea, each claiming supremacy. In the struggle between these two powers we have the clue to all mediæval and modern history. One is the Papacy; the other is the Holy Roman Empire. From the days of Constantine, according as the people became Christian, bishops exercised more and more influence in temporal affairs. They performed the functions of magistrates and judges, and so even-handed were they in administering the law the very pagans brought suit before them in preference to the civil courts. They were the counsellors and ministers of rulers. It was the bishops of France who made of France a nation. Her kings in consequence recognized their jurisdiction. Charles the Bald (A.D. 859) said that "by them he had been crowned, and to their paternal corrections and chastisements he was willing to submit."<sup>2</sup> What bishops were in their respective dioceses, the Pope came to be regarded by all Christendom. How else keep international relations upon a footing of equity? A weaker nation was helpless to right the wrongs inflicted by one more powerful. Countries far apart would find difficulty in coming to a mutual understanding. But, under the authority and through the mediation of the Supreme Head of Christendom, whom all looked upon as the father of the whole Christian family, the representative of justice and the avenger of evil-doing, wrongs might be righted and reconciliations effected under difficulties which might otherwise lead to disastrous results. And so the Pope became, by virtue of public law and by the consent of the Christian people—not by Divine right—the arbiter between sovereigns and the peacemaker among nations. His power as then recognized scarcely knew a limit. He could for sufficient reason depose kings, absolve people from allegiance to their rulers, place whole nations under interdict, quell wars, decide upon the justice of a cause, and more than once have we seen rulers place their kingdoms in fiefdom at his feet, as their only protection against a too-powerful enemy. Thus in 1214, we find Innocent III. for-

<sup>1</sup> *Holy Roman Empire*, 3d ed., p. 120.

<sup>2</sup> Hefele, iv., p. 197.



bidding any bishop or cleric, without a special mandate from the Holy See, to censure King John of England, as he had become a vassal of the Pope.<sup>1</sup>

Side by side with the Papacy, stood the Holy Roman Empire. The Emperor was the champion of the Church, pledged to her defence against all secular enemies. According to Frederick I., "Divine Providence had especially appointed the Roman Empire to prevent the continuance of schism in the Church."<sup>2</sup> The Empire was the creation of the Pope; it was not hereditary. The first Emperor was Charlemagne, crowned such at the Christmas of the year 800, by Leo III. It was Leo's own work, done for the peace and protection of the Church. The office was, like that of the Papacy itself, non-hereditary. "Each of these lofty offices," says Freeman, "is open to every baptized man; each alike is purely elective; each may be the reward of merit in any rank of life or in any corner of Christendom. While smaller offices were closely confined by local or aristocratic restrictions, the Throne of Augustus and the Chair of Peter were, in theory at least, open to the ambition of every man of orthodox belief. Even in the darkest times of aristocratic exclusiveness, no one dared to lay down as a principle that the Roman Emperor, any more than the Roman Bishop, need be of princely or Roman ancestry. Freedom of birth—Roman citizenship, in short, to clothe mediæval ideas in classical words—was all that was needed."<sup>3</sup> And so the Holy Roman Empire, now a shadow, now a power, continued to exist by the grace of the Holy See, sometimes to aid, more frequently to hinder, the Church in the exercise of her functions and prerogatives. With the hereditary title came an hereditary tendency of reversion to the absolutism of the Cæsars. Ecclesiastical privileges at first granted the emperors by the Popes, their successors in the Holy Roman Empire sought to convert into rights beyond the jurisdiction of the Papacy. The quarrel may read to us like a story of petty spites and personal squabbles; but its meaning is deeper. The very existence of the Church was involved. When bishoprics were put up for sale to the highest bidder, or were kept vacant for years that their revenues might flow into the royal or imperial coffers, it becomes evident that religion, and spiritual life, and morality must suffer, and the whole mission of the Church be frustrated. Upon more than one Pope must we accept the verdict of Neander concerning the indomitable Hildebrand: "Gregory VII. was animated by something higher than by self-seeking and selfish ambition; it was an idea which swayed him and to which he sac-

<sup>1</sup> Migne, ccxvii., p. 226. Supplem. ep. 185.

<sup>2</sup> Letter to the Prelates of Germany.

<sup>3</sup> *Historical Essays*, vi., p. 136.

rificed all other interests. It was the idea of the independence of the Church, and of a tribunal to exercise judgment over all other human relations; the idea of a religious and ethical sovereignty over the world to be exercised by the Papacy."<sup>1</sup> Those were stormy times, and it took a strong hand to curb the headlong career of the powerful when they would ride roughshod over the most sacred rights. When Philip Augustus, of France, violated the sanctity and indissolubility of the marriage-bond, it was the Popes who brought him to a sense of his duty, and compelled him to undo the great wrong he had done his injured wife, the beautiful and virtuous Ingeburge. Instances might be multiplied, in which the Popes shall be found struggling against might and prestige in the cause of the honor and dignity of womanhood. "Go through the long annals of Church history," says Cardinal Newman, "century after century, and say, was there ever a time when her bishops, and notably the Bishop of Rome, were slow to give their testimony in behalf of the moral and revealed law and to suffer for their obedience to it, or forgot that they had a message to deliver to the world? Not the task merely of administering spiritual consolation, or of making the sick-bed easy, or of training up good members of society, and of 'serving tables' (though all this was included in their range of duty); but specially and directly to deliver a message to the world, a definite message to high and low, from the world's Maker, whether men would hear or whether they would forbear. The history, surely, of the Church, in all past times, ancient as well as mediæval, is the very embodiment of that tradition of Apostolical independence and freedom of speech, which in the eyes of man is her great offence now."<sup>2</sup>

Great is the debt the nations owe the Church for having preserved throughout the ages this independence of action and of speech. Despotism and tyranny would have had little respect for any or every element that enters into our modern civilization, if there were no authority to call a halt and say in tones that were unmistakeable and that commanded respect: "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther!" This was the temporal mission of the Papacy. How staunchly and how efficiently she fulfilled her mission has been recognized by all competent historians. Few there are who are not willing to subscribe to the verdict of Ancillon: "In the Middle Ages, when there was no social order, the Papacy, and perhaps the Papacy alone, saved Europe from a state of absolute barbarism. It created relations amongst nations far removed from each other, was a common centre for all, a point of union for States otherwise iso-

---

<sup>1</sup> *Church History*, ii., p. 375. Third edition.

<sup>2</sup> Letter to the Duke of Norfolk, p. 24.

lated. It was a supreme court of justice raised in the midst of universal anarchy. Its judgments were from time to time received with the respect they merited. It fenced in and restrained the despotism of emperors. It compensated for the want of a due balance of power and lessened the injurious effects of feudal governments."<sup>1</sup> Let us add that the Papacy was more than a merely compensating principle. Based upon the supremacy of the spiritual over the material, recognized and acted upon by Christian nations possessing the same faith, it was a most secure, a most economic and a most impartial tribunal of arbitration. Has modern political science been able to furnish a better substitute?

When kings ceased to look to the Papacy for recognition and sanction, and no longer feared interdict or excommunication, they sought shelter in the Divine right of royalty to do all things. They refused to hold themselves amenable to any tribunal. "It is notorious," says the late Henry Sumner Maine, "that as soon as the decay of the Feudal System had thrown the mediæval constitutions out of working order, and when the Reformation had discredited the authority of the Pope, the doctrine of the Divine right of kings rose immediately into an importance which had never before attended it."<sup>2</sup> We all know how that doctrine brought a Charles I. to the block. Where else is despotism likely to lead? The kings of France complained of Papal interference; they found theologians to exaggerate the Papal pretensions; they sighed for the freedom of the Caliph. Well, they reduced that interference to a minimum; they endeavored to make every bishop a pope in his own diocese; they placed their tools in the diocesan seats. The theory of a national Church became popular; Gallicanism reigned; Rome received but scant respect, and what was the result? The people, exasperated against the oppressions of a century, rose in defence of rights and liberties which they were denied, and in the reeking horrors of the Revolution, became intoxicated with the blood of king and priest. Were there no Gallican Church identified with a long record of tyrannies and oppressions—had Rome been uniformly free to select its own bishops—its clergy would have been wholly identified with the people; their power and influence would have guided the storm, and instead of the guillotine and the orgies with which every student of history is familiar, a peaceful adjustment of the difficulties between king and people might have been made. This is all the more evident when we remember that the principle of the Revolution is the great underlying idea of modern times. All modern thought, all great political movements, all great social reforms are based upon the

<sup>1</sup> *Tableau des Révolutions du Système Politique de l'Europe*, ti., introd. p. 133.

<sup>2</sup> *Ancient Law*, p. 334.



sublime principle of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity rightly understood. Now, this principle has in it nothing to alarm. All the nations of the earth are marching towards its realization. In some, the awakening is earlier than in others. This was the underlying idea of the old Republic of Florence, "which would have no king because its king was Jesus Christ;"<sup>1</sup> it was the underlying idea that led to the Constitution of 1688, in England; it nerved the cantons of Switzerland to struggle against Austrian domination till they were free as the chamois ranging their beloved Alps; it gave birth to our own republic. Its spirit is in the air and will not down. Statesmen and governments may slight or ignore or even resist it; but such a course is one of folly. They who will not recognize it and give it direction and prepare men for its coming, will be borne down by its fierce impetus.

Again, since the treaty of Westphalia, Europe has been adjusted by what is known as balance of power. According to this principle, no one nation will be allowed to assume control beyond a certain limit. She may absorb a certain number of districts or provinces belonging to a weaker power, but, in order to preserve an equilibrium, she must not destroy that power. Or, a weaker power is a source of trouble to more powerful nations in her neighborhood. As a solution to the difficulty, why may they not—even as happened to Poland—carve the weaker nation up and distribute a share to each, still preserving, the equilibrium? These are events that could not have occurred under the arbitration of the Popes. A merely mechanical principle, with no other basis than expedience, no other motive than policy, such as is this principle of balance of power, must needs be immoral in its very nature and lead to acts of gross injustice. It is bearing its fruits to-day in Europe. Look at the attitude of all the great powers on the Continent! Each is in arms, grimly awaiting war. The strong and the young are idly consuming the products of the soil, and the nations are becoming impoverished. All human ingenuity and all triumphs of physical science are concentrated upon the discovery of the most rapid and most effectual methods of destroying human life. This state of affairs is radically wrong. Who would not rejoice to see every nation of Europe disarm, go back to the arts of peace, and leave the arbitration of all international difficulties to the Pope?

The Holy Roman Empire has passed into shadow-land. The doctrine of the absolute right of kings to perpetrate all acts in God's name, and under the Divine sanction, is no more. Even where crowned heads still exist in Europe, not they, but their peoples—Russia being excepted—rule. The world's future is altogether in the hands of the people. The relations of Church

---

<sup>1</sup> Cardinal Capecepolo: *Life of St. Philip Neri*, vol. i., p. 34.

and State in the new order of things may easily prove far more satisfactory than in the old order. In our own American Republic these relations are almost ideal. We know that purely ideal relations between Church and State obtain only where religion is one in society. Then might the secular power be subject to the spiritual power, as the body is subject to the soul; then might the State co-operate with the Church, aiding her when necessary in her work of establishing the kingdom of God in souls, knowing that all else, bearing upon temporal happiness, will surely follow. Here, where the forms of Christian belief are many, this order of things is impossible. But the order of things, guaranteed us by our Constitution and our laws, is admirable.

The noble patriots who framed our Constitution and laid so firmly the foundations of our republic, built upon the rights and liberties inherent in man. Now these rights and liberties with their accompanying duties and responsibilities, as between man and man, are not of the State. They are above and beyond the State. They are the vital principle that gives being to the State. They are the natural law, which is a participation in the eternal law of God. The State is simply the mouth-piece to proclaim this law, and the instrument to enforce it. The principles of right and wrong existed before they were made to enter into statutory decrees, just as the Decalogue was engraved on the hearts of men before Moses inscribed it on tablets of stone. Those principles are eternal, and it is our pride and our glory and the secret of our prosperity as a people that the great charter of our liberties is based upon them. In consequence the State admits the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience. Every man has his rights of conscience not as privileges conceded by the State, but as rights existing among his other natural rights, recognized and acknowledged by the State as held under a higher law than its own. Church and State do not here exist upon a system of mutual concessions or privileges. There is here no absorption of one into the other. They are distinct, but they are not separated. On the contrary, their union is most intimate and most harmonious. "There is nothing," says Brownson, "which Gregory VII., Innocent III., Boniface VIII. and other great popes struggled for against the German emperors, the kings of France, Aragon and England, and the Italian republics that is not recognized here by our republic to be the right of the spiritual order. Here the old antagonism between Church and State does not exist. There is here a certain antagonism, no doubt, between the Church and the sects, but none between the Church and the State or civil society. Here the Church has, so far as civil society is concerned, all that she has ever claimed, all that she has ever struggled for. Here

she is perfectly free. She summons her prelates to meet in council when she pleases, and promulgates her decrees for the spiritual government of her children without leave asked or obtained. The *placet* of the civil power is not needed, is neither solicited nor accepted. She erects and fills sees as she judges proper, founds and conducts schools, colleges, and seminaries in her own way, without let or hindrance; she manages her own temporalities, not by virtue of a grant or concession of the State, but as her acknowledged right, held as the right of conscience, independently of the State."<sup>1</sup>

Where society is split up into a diversity of creeds, there is supreme wisdom in the attitude of the State towards all, granting freedom of conscience so long as conscience dictates nothing contrary to the principles of natural right, or calculated to outrage the moral sense of society. We ask no closer relations of Church and State. So far as our religion is concerned, our sole cry is: "Hands off!" The State is incompetent to pronounce upon religious matters; it has no mission to determine the validity of a religious creed. To discriminate in favor of any one to the exclusion of all the others, were an act of injustice to every citizen not holding the favored creed. It were un-American because it were unconstitutional. It is a primary duty of the State to aid and protect its citizens in the fulfilment of their respective duties, to secure to them their inalienable rights, to see that justice is done between man and man; above all is it a duty of the State to safeguard the weak minorities in their rights and immunities against the more powerful majorities.

In every man and woman there is an inseparable union of Church and State. Each holds certain religious tenets; many belong to some visible form of Christianity; but in proportion as all live up to their religious convictions, in that proportion are they good citizens, faithful in the performance of their civic duties—honest and honorable and just in all relations of life. Christian virtue in Christian society has never dimmed the civic virtues. Tell us, would the New England Puritans—the revered ancestors of many whom we now address—have left so lasting an impression upon this republic if they had been less intensely religious? The fierceness and asperity and intolerance that entered into their religious convictions and dictated the Colonial Blue Laws, also shaped the rigid honesty and integrity of character that would die rather than deviate a hair's breadth from the path of rectitude. When that noble son of Connecticut, Nathan Hale, was about to be hanged as a spy, his sole regret was that he had not other lives to give

---

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, vol. xiii., p. 142.



for his country. Think you he was any the less sturdy a patriot because he had been strictly and religiously brought up in the stern tenets of his Puritan father? Can you imagine Charles Carroll of Carrollton, throwing his broad acres and his spotless name into the country's cause, any the less a patriot because he had been carefully trained by the Jesuits? Did he find any difficulty in reconciling his allegiance to Rome with his allegiance to the new-born republic? Was his cousin John Carroll, the first Catholic Archbishop of Baltimore, less a patriot, when he accompanied the commission who sought the alliance of Canada in the cause of independence, than John Jay, when by his fanatical address to the people of Great Britain, he rendered that alliance an impossibility?<sup>1</sup> This is a subject over which men have needlessly waxed wroth. Let us raise ourselves above prejudice and look facts full in the face, and we will find, each in his own person, complete reconciliation between Church and State. Is not every full and perfect life an harmonious blending of these two orders of duties?" In this fact is the solution to the whole problem of Church and State. The name of God may not be in our Constitution, but His hand is discernible in every line of it. With far-seeing wisdom was that first amendment inserted: *Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.*

---

<sup>1</sup> See a valuable article by John Gilmary Shea, in the *U. S. Catholic Historical Magazine*, vol. iii., No. x., "Why Canada is not a Part of the United States,"

## GOD'S SAINTS THE TRUE REFORMERS IN HIS CHURCH.

IN the article on the family, early education, and first monastic labors of St. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, the reader has only seen, faintly and rapidly outlined, the preparatory period of the Saint's extraordinary mission in the Church. We have now to follow him through the principal phases of the providential career fulfilled by him from 1127 till his death in 1153.

The effect produced by his "Apology," or Defence of Citeaux, and his brief work on the "Duties of Bishops," was not limited to the total change wrought in the life of the great French Chancellor, the Abbot Suger of Saint Denis; the lecture of these writings made a no less deep and salutary impression on other prelates, whom the influence of feudalism had raised to eminent positions in the Church, and whose lives, at first, had only been governed by feudal notions and the maxims of a worldly ambition.

The Bishop of Paris, in 1127, happened to be another feudal noble, Etienne de Senlis, who had been thrust into the Church by his family, without any vocation, and whose conduct, in his high office, had been altogether worldly and unedifying. The conversion of the Abbot Suger was soon followed by that of the Bishop of Paris, who retired from the gay and splendid court circles, and devoted himself entirely to the discharge of his duties as pastor. As this prelate was a great favorite with Louis VI., and one of the brightest ornaments of his court, the prince, as in the case of Suger, took the withdrawal of the former as a personal grievance. Suger, however, was persuaded to retain his office of Chancellor and Prime Minister. But no persuasion availed to make Etienne de Senlis resume his place near the monarch.

He went further: he reduced his household to what was absolutely indispensable, both in numbers and in expenditure, only retaining in his service such persons as were distinguished by piety and learning. This reform he consistently endeavored to introduce in all the religious houses of his diocese, both secular and regular. He failed to bring back the canons of his cathedral to the practices of common life once in use among the clergy of collegiate churches. The canons of Paris stoutly refused to adopt the new life proposed by their bishop, although he nobly proposed to set them the example.

At length, wearied by their resistance, the bishop deprived them of their benefices, and called the reformed clerics of the Abbey of

St. Victor to fill the places thus left vacant. Inasmuch, however, as the revenues of the cathedral chapter, like those of the See of Paris itself, were derived from the feudal property allotted to them by the crown, the canons had some legal right to appeal for redress to the king. Louis, deeply wounded as he had been, by the disappearance from court of the bishop, whom he had cherished as his bosom friend, warmly espoused the cause of the canons. The bishop's property of every description was therefore seized and all his revenues were confiscated.

This was one of the miserable results of feudalism in its relations with the Church. And modern statecraft, as we know from too many contemporary examples, is only doing in the 19th century what Louis VI. did in the 12th.

The Bishop of Paris, driven from his See, and left without a roof to cover him, took refuge with his metropolitan, the Archbishop of Sens. But, before leaving Paris, he had launched an interdict against the king.

As the latter had sought, in the beginning of his reign, to become affiliated, in so far as he could, with the monks of Citeaux, these were fain to make peace between the sovereign and the bishop. The General Chapter of the Order remonstrated in vain; and, at length, it was thought that the Abbot of Clairvaux should be deputed to Paris as a peacemaker.

Bernard was welcomed in the capital of France with the most extraordinary enthusiasm. The king yielded somewhat, or seemed to yield, and a momentary peace was obtained. But the quarrel soon broke out anew, and there appeared no way of settling the difficulty but by having recourse to Rome. Meanwhile, the Pope, Honorius II., had been induced to raise, unconditionally, the interdict pronounced by the Bishop of Paris. The king was emboldened by this to proceed against the latter with merciless rigor.

The Abbot of Clairvaux at once undertook to defend what he considered to be the cause of right and of ecclesiastical liberty against both the King and the Pope.

"The complaints of the episcopal body," the Saint writes to the Pontiff, "and the tears of the universal Church . . . must surely have reached you. Compelled by necessity to leave the silence of my solitude and to go forth into the world, I now make bold to tell you what I have seen. What I have seen,—let me say it with grief,—is that the honor of the Church is imperiled during the Pontificate of Honorius II. The respectful but firm attitude of the Bishops had already overcome the royal resentment, when the Sovereign Pontiff, by interposing his supreme authority, discouraged their episcopal constancy and furnished the king with new motives for his arrogance. We know that your conscience



has been misled, and that people have not scrupled to lay before you false statements, as is evident from the tenor of your letters,— and all that for the purpose of inducing you to raise the interdict which had been so justly fulminated.

“ Now, however, that the falsehood is made manifest, let it be used us a weapon against its author. Will Your Holiness permit iniquity to pervert your judgment? What astonishes us is that you have judged both parties without hearing them, and that you have condemned the absent.”<sup>1</sup>

Meanwhile all the prelates who approved of the conduct of the Bishop of Paris, or who did not openly condemn him, were involved in the violent measures employed by Louis VI. against his former favorite. The Archbishop of Sens and the Abbot of Clairvaux undertook together a second mission of conciliation to the Court. It was all in vain. Then it was that the Saint, like one of the prophets of old sent to the prevaricating princes of Samaria or Jerusalem, uttered this terrible threat: “ Since you despise the voice of God himself,” he said to Louis, “ by turning a deaf ear to the supplications of your bishops, expect a fearful chastisement. Ere long the hand of death shall suddenly snatch away the heir to your throne, now so tenderly beloved.”<sup>2</sup> The event fulfilled the Saint’s prediction. But Louis VI. paused not a moment in his career of unrighteous and sacrilegious vindictiveness. Nor did the courageous Abbot cease to urge Honorius II. to set aside the considerations of worldly prudence and policy and to come out boldly in the defense of the persecuted Bishops.

At length the Pope sent a legate to France, and a council was convened at Troyes, the capital of the powerful Count of Champagne. To this assembly the legate invited the Abbot of Clairvaux, who, on his return from Paris, was once more prostrated by fever. A first refusal, though based on the peremptory reason of what seemed a hopeless illness, was attributed by the King’s partisans to resentment against Rome. And this determined the sick man to accept, at all risks, the second invitation of the Cardinal Legate.

“ My heart was ever ready to obey you,” he writes to the latter, “ but my weak body did not share the willingness of the spirit. Consumed by a violent and burning fever and deprived of all strength, this poor frame of mine could not respond to your desire. Nevertheless, I only wished to obey you. . . . Illness, not caprice, dictated my first answer. . . .

“ You say that we have to decide a matter of supreme importance. For that you need a man in every way equal to what

<sup>1</sup> Letter 46.

<sup>2</sup> Chevallier, I., 187.

the occasion requires. If you have deemed me to be such a man I must tell you candidly that I am not the person you need. Either the solution you seek, and which you want to trust to the skill of your friend, while drawing him forth from his solitude, is an easy solution, or it is not. If it is an easy one, there is no need of my agency. If it is a truly difficult one, it surely is beyond my ability. You cannot convince me that I can compass what others despair of.

"Should it be otherwise, I would ask thee, O, my God, why thou hast erred in calling me to my present profession by hiding under a bushel the light which should have been placed on the candlestick? Why, indeed, have sought to make of me a monk? Why bury, far away from every danger, in the silence of the cloister, the man needed by the whole world, the man without whom our bishops can accomplish nothing? But enough of excuses. Be it as it may, rest assured that I go to you through obedience alone. Only, in future, I pray you, spare me as much as ever you can."<sup>1</sup>

The King, apparently, only waited for the meeting of the council to comply with what St. Bernard had so eloquently urged him to do long before. But his tardy acquiescence did not repair the injury done to religion and to his own subjects. Innocent blood had been shed. The calamity foretold by St. Bernard soon afterwards fell upon king and kingdom,—an awful warning to the princes and nobles of that day not to trust to might alone in their contentions with the unarmed spiritual power.

In that same council another bishop, whose worldly extravagance had made him sadly notorious, was compelled to submit to canonical discipline, and soon afterwards deprived of his See. Thus the spirit which the Abbot of Clairvaux had evoked was working for the reform of Church and State. A worldly-minded abbot, who had allowed indiscipline and a lax morality to creep into his monastery, was also deposed from his office.

This same council, held in the year 1128, will be ever memorable as the assemblage which sanctioned the establishment of the Military Religious Order of Knights Templars. Hugh de Payens and the five noble soldiers, who formed the nucleus of this far-famed society, had begun their devoted services in Palestine in 1118. The King of Jerusalem had lodged them in his own palace near the ruins of Solomon's Temple. And after two years of heroic labor and spotless lives the six founders asked the Council of Troyes and the legate of the Holy See to accept their services officially, and to sanction them by giving to themselves and their future

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter 21.

companions a Rule of Life and Constitutions in conformity with their purpose.

The Council entrusted to the Abbot of Clairvaux the task of drawing up this body of by-laws for an order destined to be half soldiers and half monks. He did so in obedience to the commands of the august assembly, and framed for the Templars Constitutions so full of the spirit of God and so admirably adapted to the dual life these men were to lead, that so long as they remained faithful to their Rule and its spirit, they were the admiration of all Christendom, uniting the exalted heroism of the Christian soldier with the supernatural virtues of the cloister.

They looked up to St. Bernard as their true founder and spiritual parent. And thus once more did Providence make the light of the Valley of Bitterness shine forth with surpassing splendor and prove that the man whose life seemed to hang on so slender a thread was in very truth, the man needed by the whole world.

No sooner had the Council of Troyes ended its labors than the Abbot of Clairvaux hastened to bury himself in his beloved solitude. The fever which still clung to him, and which was the result both of his extreme bodily austerities and of his superhuman labors, had made him an object of anxious concern to the prelates and nobles assembled at Troyes. When these separated, and the saint was free to return home, the energy which supported him through the sittings of the Council and through the manifold work devolved on himself, suddenly gave way, and the monks of Clairvaux only welcomed back what they thought was a dying man.

But the very atmosphere of the cloister, with its penitential rigors, its silence broken in upon by the psalmody of the divine office, and the holy ardor with which the abbot daily sought to feed with the bread of life the souls of his brethren, lifted the frail body above itself. The light which Bernard of Clairvaux shed unceasingly around him, and the words of heavenly instruction which fell from his lips, seemed to come from a being always hovering between the confines of this visible world of ours and the eternal world unseen.

It was during the intervals of comparative rest allowed him by the termination of some mighty public affair, and by the extreme feebleness unfitting him for the ordinary fatigues of monastic life, that St. Bernard embodied in hastily written treatises the teachings required by the errors which were abroad, or by the aspirations of his contemporaries toward a higher spirituality. Thus were written the two books on "The Love of God" and "The Free Will of Man." When we say that he wrote such works hastily, we do not mean that the composition bore marks of undue haste and consequent incorrectness in the matter and imperfection in the form.



There is in all the writings of this holy doctor of the Church a glow of inspiration which makes the reader feel that the instruction therein contained was poured forth under the pressure of a heavenly and overpowering force. The saint's well-disciplined mind moulded, naturally and instinctively, all his conceptions into perfect form. His beautiful style gave these an easy and graceful expression. When he wrote he obeyed the impulsion of the Spirit; he seemed in haste to give vent to thoughts which he could no longer contain. His mind flowed forth with a force that was irresistible, as the accumulated waters of an Alpine lake rush impetuously downward to the valleys beneath.

But while restored, helpless and feeble in body as an infant, to Clairvaux after the Council of Troyes, the saint was not long permitted to enjoy the sweets of uninterrupted communion with the Divine Majesty, and with the great religious family who worshipped him with more than filial love and reverence. The severe disciplinary decrees enacted by the late Council, and the reforms effected in more than one class of persons, met with a sturdy resistance in men whose ideas of propriety and morality were regulated by feudal pride and tradition much more than by that beauty of holiness so loved by the Church of God, and so ardently cherished by her true children. The worldlings in the Church whom Bernard sought to reform or to expel from the sanctuary, and the worldlings outside of the sanctuary, whose code of morals was framed in accordance with their own love and earthly ideals, soon raised a loud clamor throughout France. The Abbot of Clairvaux, it was said, had been the soul of the Council of Troyes. Nothing had been done there save by his dictation. Louis VI., apparently, had yielded without even a show of reluctance to the wishes of the Holy See and the righteous demands of the French prelates. But the courtier prelates,—and there were not a few of them,—together with the members of the inferior clergy, both regular and secular, to whom the new discipline seemed an intolerable hardship, complained, protested and appealed to Rome.

Papal Rome in every age, and under every Pontificate, likes not to be annoyed by dissensions in distant countries which the wisdom and mutual forbearance of the secular and ecclesiastical authorities might compose between themselves. The secular clergy of France, in 1128, did not want to have the monks of either Citeaux or Clairvaux continually called upon to arbitrate in the differences which arose in Church or State. How, said they, should men buried away in the seclusion of the cloister know better than seculars how to treat of difficulties occurring in the common paths of every-day life in the world? So the discontented and the aggrieved besieged with their complaints the Court of Rome, and, as the

Abbot of Clairvaux was accused of having done all the mischief by interfering in worldly matters which concerned him not, it was judged to be a proper thing to admonish him. "These noisy and importunate frogs must not again come out of their marshes to disturb the Holy See and the Cardinals!" Thus wrote the Cardinal-Chancellor Haimeric to St. Bernard by order of the Pope.

Pope and cardinal were sadly mistaken in the man if they thought that they could disturb his equanimity or quench his zeal for the beauty of God's house by such unseemly reproaches, which, moreover, savored of ingratitude.

"Ought I to regret or to congratulate myself," the saint replies, "that I have raised up enemies by upholding the truth,—nay, by accomplishing a good work and fulfilling a duty? Can people not find in me enough of real defects without imputing to me a praise-worthy deed as if it were a crime? If I have done wrong in anything, it is in being present at these assemblages instead of remaining buried in my chosen solitude, of sitting in judgment on my own conduct alone, of subjecting my own conscience to a severe examination. I do not lose sight of the fact that my calling is to live the life of a monk, that is, to be a recluse in reality as well as in repute.

"Well, I have mixed myself up with the affairs of which you write. What induced me to do so? I was called thither and compelled perforce to go. My friends regretted that I yielded, but my regret was greater than theirs. Rest assured that I sincerely wish I had never consented, even as I now do, never to find myself under a like necessity. And who is better able than you, my excellent friend, to relieve me of such a necessity? You have the power to do so, and I know you have also the will.

"I am happy to think that you judge me to be unfit for the management of such affairs. In this you are right. I see in it a proof of your friendship. Yes; forbid 'these noisy and troublesome frogs' to leave their obscure and marshy abode. Let them never again be heard to croak in public assemblies. Let them not dare to obtrude themselves into the palaces of the great. Let no necessity, no authority, prevail on them to be mixed up with disputes or important transactions.

"Thereby will your friend be enabled to escape any just suspicion of being presumptuous. I cannot foresee what should justify the reproach of his being so. For I am firmly resolved never again to set foot outside of my abbey, unless compelled to do so in the interests of our Order, or by the formal command of the Holy See, or that of my own bishop. These are the only cases in which to refuse would be sinful.

"Never send me such commands. I shall then live in peace; and I shall let others do the same.

"Nevertheless, it will be in vain to bury myself here, in vain to keep silence; the whole Church will meanwhile cry out against the Court of Rome, if it condemns the absent to please its own familiars."<sup>1</sup>

Certain it is that the brief interval which elapsed between their correspondence and the death of Honorius II., on February 14, 1130, was employed to good purpose by the Abbot of Clairvaux. But the schism which followed fast on the election of the successor of Honorius, Innocent II., and the distracted state of Christendom, divided between the claims of two rival Popes, soon forced St. Bernard to quit his retreat.

Louis VI. determined to put a speedy stop to the schism, and summoned a general meeting of bishops and prelates at Etampes; he wrote to the Abbot of Clairvaux, in particular, begging him to be present with his brother-abbots. When this assembly met, toward the end of April, St. Bernard failed not to be there. His early biographer relates that on his way to Etampes the Saint had a vision, in which he beheld the assembled universal Church singing with one voice the praises of the Most High.

At any rate, no sooner did the Council of Etampes meet, than the prelates unanimously besought the Abbot of Clairvaux to pronounce on the rival claims of Innocent and Anacletus, pledging themselves to abide by his decision. The judgment of the assembled bishops was also to be ratified by the king.

Bernard pronounced in favor of Innocent II., who had been the first chosen by a part of the Sacred College. The bishops at once ratified the judgment of the Saint, which was also sanctioned by the king; and thus was France won to the obedience of the lawful pontiff.

Meanwhile, Innocent, obliged to quit Rome and Italy, by the feudal nobles and the Italian Free Cities, who supported Anacletus, had crossed the Alps, and was welcomed by Louis VI. and the majority of his people. The ambitious Bishop of Angoulême, disappointed at not being maintained in his office of Papal Legate by Pope Innocent, afterward went over to Anacletus, and carried with him the Duke of Aquitaine. But this local schism was, in due time, to be healed by the eloquence and miracles of St. Bernard. In 1130 all France was at the feet of Innocent II.

The king of England held aloof, uncertain as to whom he should pay the homage due to the Vicar of Christ. But he, too, soon yielded to the arguments and influence of the Abbot of Clairvaux.

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter 48, as quoted by Chevallier.



Then came the turn of Germany, where the emperor-elect, Lothaire, was first partly won over to the legitimate Pope by St. Norbert, Archbishop of Magdeburg.

This happened after the Assembly of Etampes. Innocent, who gladly acknowledged in the Abbot of Clairvaux the man specially raised up by God to heal the wounds of the Church, and to reunite divided Christendom, would not part with him, and would have him constantly by his side as the counsellor and guide in whose inspired wisdom he could wholly trust. The Chancellor Haimeric, also, who had been chiefly instrumental in the election of Innocent II., was but too glad to make the Saint forget the unjust and offensive letter about frogs quitting their marshes and annoying Pope and Cardinals by their croaking.

We need no other assurance, however, than our knowledge of St. Bernard's own unselfish character and entire devotion to the dearest interests of religion, to believe that he needed no apology from the Chancellor or the Pontiff before he espoused the cause of Innocent as that of the true successor of St. Peter.

Innocent had arranged to meet the emperor-elect, Lothaire, at Liège, on March 24, 1130. The meeting was one to be long remembered. The Pope entered the city having St. Bernard by his side, and followed by a cortege of Cardinals, prelates and nobles. Lothaire, on foot, led by the bridle the Pope's white hackney, and with a wand made way among the dense throng for the Holy Father.

The next day, the 25th of March, the Pope celebrated pontifical mass, and Lothaire paid him solemn homage as to the lawful head of the Church, binding himself by oath to restore him to the peaceful possession of Rome.

But in the very midst of this solemn scene, the Emperor-elect demands, as the reward of his services, that Innocent shall acknowledge the imperial right of *investiture*. This was reopening the old bitter quarrel between Church and State, between the temporal power and the spiritual—the feudal lord demanding that the Church shall do him homage for its temporal possessions, and that Pope and bishop shall hold themselves his vassals and inferiors in the political order. To resist this unhallowed claim, Pope St. Gregory VII. had resisted to the utmost the pretensions of the German emperors, and died in exile.

St. Bernard, who had been the guide and stay of Innocent II. up to that moment, then stood forth as the defender of the most sacred rights of the Papacy and of the Church. He appealed to the entire assembly, laymen and clergymen, setting briefly and luminously before them the grounds of the Imperial claim, and the imprescriptible rights of the spiritual authority. Recalling eloquently

the deplorable and sanguinary dissensions which had arisen in Europe from the urging of the pretensions now again put forth, the Saint asks his hearers to give their judgment fearlessly.

With one voice, repeated again and again, they declare that the Emperor-elect is wrong. The latter was too much of a politician to persist in pressing a demand which the popular voice thus energetically condemned. He openly declared that he would abide by the Concordat of Worms, concluded in 1122 under the pontificate of Calixtus II., and by which the Emperor had renounced the assumed right of investing bishops with the ring and the crozier.

The sovereigns of Spain and Portugal, then struggling heroically with the Moors, were not long in giving in their adhesion to the cause of Innocent II. And here again history attests that it was the influence of the Abbot of Clairvaux and the fame of his transcendent virtues, which were the determining motives of this accession to the party of the lawful Pope.

In October, 1131, Innocent II. held the Council of Rheims, in which all these sovereigns renewed their homage to him, thus practically condemning the schismatic Anacletus. In this Council, Louis VI., who was still plunged in grief for the loss of his son, cut off suddenly by a tragic death, as St. Bernard had foretold, caused the Pope to crown his second son, Louis VII. This solemn ceremony reminded all present of the prophetic warning given to a tyrannical king, and of the crimes against the Church, which drew down on royalty such an awful punishment.

That same year the Pope visited Clairvaux, wishing not only to give the Abbot a public testimony of his gratitude, but to see with his own eyes an establishment of which universal fame spoke such wonders.

The monks came forth to meet the splendid pontifical cortege, and it was a sight which neither Innocent nor his companions could ever afterward recall without the deepest emotion. At Clairvaux, monastery and church were spacious enough to contain the ever-increasing family, from which, as from a teeming hive, swarms of holy religious were continually issuing, bearing with them wherever they settled the sweet odor of Christ and the supernatural spirit of self-sacrifice received from the lessons and examples of their saintly parent. From the lowly gates of the great monastery, Innocent II. beheld issuing to meet him a long train of white-robed monks, who, with eyes never raised from the ground, chanted the prescribed anthems of the ritual, and welcomed him as the one who came to them in the name of the Lord. There was in the sacred songs sung in Clairvaux nothing resembling our harmonized nineteenth century music. But the Gregorian music

of anthem, psalm and hymn was the echo of Eastern harmonies coming from far-distant ages, reminding one of St. Ambrose, St. Augustine and St. Martin of Tours, of St. Benedict and St. Maur. The grave and unearthly melody lifted the soul upwards, and as one looked upon the pale, emaciated, spiritualized and love-lit features of the singers, with their downcast eyes and angelic modesty, one thought not of earth but of heaven, and fancied that the life here led was indeed supernatural.

At the head of the white-robed procession was borne aloft a cross composed of a knotted pole with a transverse arm of the same wood and shape. There was no sculptured image of the Crucified. His likeness was deeply impressed on the heart and the life of every one of these blessed solitaries. Aye, blessed, and most blessed, in very truth were they deemed and called by those who looked on them as on some vision of the regions nearest Paradise!

They lead the Pontiff to the Church. There, too, everything his eye rests upon is unlike anything ever yet seen in such holy places. The walls are naked; the very altars speak of poverty. Their sole ornament is a simple crucifix, reminding the beholder of the God of Calvary, the Guest of our Tabernacles. The stalls for the monks are made of rough planks, and so are the benches on which they support themselves during the long psalmody. Everything is wanting in their sanctuary in the wilderness, save the one TREASURE which is to the inmates all in all, their Emmanuel, the God ever with them to inspire them continually to higher aims and holier deeds, and to give them by His abiding presence the foretaste of the everlasting possession.

"Joy filled all hearts on that day," says Ernaldus in his "Life of St. Bernard."<sup>1</sup> "It was a great feast in the Abbey. But it was not one celebrated by the fare usual in worldly banquets. The bread on the tables was made of coarse flour. The wine was thin and sour. Instead of turbot the dishes contained the vegetables grown in the monks' garden. Before the Pope was placed a poor fish that had been sent from a distance and which no one remarked."

Innocent could not restrain his admiration. Clairvaux surpassed all that he had heard of monastic austerity and religious heroism. He could not leave it without recording his grateful sense of the Abbot's services. He drew up on the spot a bull conferring on the Cistercians special privileges which Bernard neither asked for nor could decline.

"It is to thee, Bernard," the Pontiff says, "it is to thy invinci-

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter 352.



ble constancy and zeal in the dark days of schism; it is to the courage shown by thee in defending our Israel; it is to the authority begotten of thy influence, bringing back to the fold of Peter kings, princes, and all powers ecclesiastical and secular, that we owe the triumph of the Church and the peace of the Holy See." <sup>1</sup>

The work accomplished up to that moment by the Abbot of Clairvaux was only half the work yet to be done, to extinguish the schism totally.

Innocent II. returned to Italy in the spring of 1132, taking St. Bernard with him, much against the will of the latter, and to the great regret of the monks of Clairvaux. The Pope relied on the solemn promise of the Emperor-elect Lothaire, who was, at the head of an army, to expel Anacletus from Rome, to restore Innocent to his See, and to receive from the hands of the latter the imperial crown. But the Pope relied more on the preternatural influence exercised by the Abbot of Clairvaux than on the support of the German armies.

The anti-Pope had for his allies Roger of Sicily and his Normans, the Republic of Milan, whose archbishop, Anselmo di Pusterla, had warmly espoused the cause of the schismatics, and the powerful Roman barons devoted to Anacletus, and who counted numerous adherents among the nobles of the Free Cities of Italy. Florence, Bologna and Siena were still to be won, and far more important was it to gain the maritime republics of Pisa or Genoa, whose fleets swept the Mediterranean.

Innocent rightly believed that the very appearance in Italy of the saintly Abbot of Clairvaux would act like a spell on the populations,—that the prestige of his sanctity and of the miracles which he wrought everywhere, much more than his marvellous eloquence, would overcome all opposition and secure the triumph of the Holy See.

And the event justified the hopes of the Pontiff. Piedmont and Piacenza gave Innocent and his companion an enthusiastic welcome. Pisa opened her gates to them, and pledged to the exiled Pope a fidelity that never afterwards wavered. Genoa, meanwhile, watched with no friendly eye the proceedings of her neighbor and rival. The adhesion of Pisa to the cause of Innocent was, in the state of feeling which then prevailed, a good reason why Genoa should declare for Anacletus.

To prevent such a calamity, Bernard hastened to Genoa. His progress along the Riviera was what might have marked the advance of an archangel had one come down visibly from heaven to visit the northern shore of the Peninsula. The proud Genoese restrained at first their true feelings. The Saint was received re-

spectfully, joyfully even, but there was a shade of distrust in the popular joy. No sooner, however, did the white frock of the Cistercian show itself in the pulpit of the Cathedral, no sooner did the pale, emaciated features of the man of God look down on the rapt multitude beneath, than the usual spell began to work. His words fell like electric sparks on the hearts of his hearers.

The fame of his sanctity, as well as that of his learning, had long ago crossed the Alps. Learned men Italy possessed in abundance. But the very appearance of Bernard brought with it the conviction that he was one of God's messengers, sent to bring peace to troubled souls, and to make peace as well between warring peoples. Nevertheless, the Abbot of Clairvaux, accustomed to thoroughly instruct his audience, whether in his own monastery or in the cities of France and Germany, on the great truths he expounded, had resolved to enlighten the Genoese on the true origin of the existing schism, and the grounds on which Pope and anti-Pope rested their claims to the obedience of Christendom. Three times each day he called the citizens to the Cathedral. It needed not many days' labor to convince them who was the rightful Pontiff.

Having gained this first victory, the Saint profited by the enthusiasm and veneration manifested by the multitude to bind Pisa and Genoa together by a true sisterly feeling. The chords of brotherly charity in these Christian hearts, touched by the hand of a saint, break forth in divinest harmony. The prisons in which the captive soldiers of Pisa have so long languished, unransomed and despairing, are at once thrown open. Genoa can refuse nothing to Innocent II. and his eloquent representative.

Innocent, on his side, raises the See of Genoa to Archiepiscopal rank. The occupant of the See, carried away by the current of generosity which sweeps over the warlike city, declares that he will vacate his position, and asks the Abbot of Clairvaux to take his place. The people, moved by the spontaneous act of their Bishop, with one voice demand of the saintly Abbot to be the first Archbishop of Genoa, and close the gates of the city lest he should escape the honor thus thrust upon him. It is all in vain. Friends who appreciate the Saint's humility help him out of this new danger. And he returns to Pisa to receive the grateful thanks of the Pope and the citizens.

It is, for us especially, who have so lately visited Pisa and Genoa, studying their annals and examining the splendid monuments of the bygone days of Catholic living faith, of heroic and fruitful liberty inspired by faith, unspeakably sad to think of what these two glorious little republics were in 1132 and what they are to-day. We cannot read without emotion the noble letter which St.

Bernard hastened to write to the Genoese on his safe arrival in Pisa :

"With what blessed results for the Church my mission to you has been attended," he says. "With what demonstrations of honor you received and treated me during my too brief stay. . . . May the Almighty take on Himself to repay you. For how can I make you a fitting return for that love of yours so full of reverence, trust and devotion. . . . O happy days that have passed away all too rapidly ! No, indeed, never can I forget you, devoted people, great-hearted commonwealth, illustrious city ! . . .

"I had come to sow the good seed among you. See what an abundant harvest has come of it. A single day, as it were, has witnessed the scattering of the seed and the ripening of the grain. It was such a blessed mission, bringing to the exile and the prisoner the hope of recovering their liberty and beholding once more their native land ; a mission which filled our adversaries with dismay, which covered the schismatics with confusion, while it was fruitful in glory to the Church and happiness to the nations.

"What remains to me now to do, O beloved ones, but to exhort you to persevere. Perseverance alone, as you know, secures the glory won by the brave of heart and the crown due to the heroic. . . . Treasure up jealously, therefore, the teachings to which you listened with so much fervor.

"Foster peace with your brethren of Pisa. Continue in your obedience to the Pope. Be faithful to the Emperor, and careful to promote the glory of your city. . . . Should you enter upon warlike enterprises, let them not be directed against your neighbors or your friends. Attack rather the enemies of the Church. Then shall your conquests be both more glorious and more just. May the God of peace and love be ever with you."<sup>1</sup>

Meanwhile, Anacletus, the better to secure the support of Roger II., of Sicily, gave over or guaranteed to the latter, by the treaty of Avellino, the possession of Sicily and of all southern Italy, together with Capua and Naples.<sup>2</sup> Conrad of Hohenstauffen, the rival of Lothaire, who was also pledged to the anti-Pope, had received the Iron Crown of Italy, at Monza and Milan, from the hands of Archbishop Anselmo. So the odds stood formidable in the Peninsula in favor of the Schism. And when Lothaire crossed the Alps, in August, 1132, with his German army, this only amounted to a body of 2000 cavalry. Verona closed its gates against him as he arrived in the plains of upper Italy, and Cremona only received him to insult and deride himself and his escort.

Innocent and St. Bernard joined the Emperor-elect at Roncaglia,

<sup>1</sup> Letter 129.

<sup>2</sup> Chevallier, i., 260.



and the little army set out for Rome, while the united fleets of Genoa and Pisa watched the mouths of the Tiber to prevent the Sicilians from landing any forces along the coast. The anti-Pope, terrified by the approach of Lothaire, shut himself up in the Castle Sant Angelo, leaving the rest of the city to Innocent and his ally.

Thus it happened that Lothaire was crowned Emperor by the Pope at St. John Lateran on the fourth of June. This was all Lothaire wanted. He forthwith set out for Germany, leaving the Pope to face his enemies singlehanded. Unwilling to shed the blood of his own people, the lawful Pontiff returned at once to Pisa. There, at least, he would be safe from the attacks of the schismatical Italians. And there the Abbot of Clairvaux left him until the spring-tide of 1134.

Innocent had convened a council in Pisa with the well-founded hope that the deliberations of such an assemblage would contribute to put an end to the scandalous division in the Church. The King of France, however, would not allow the prelates of his kingdom to obey the summons of the Pope. He fell back on the pretension of the Byzantine Emperors, that to the secular power belonged the privilege of assembling such councils. It was a claim as old as Cæsarism itself, both ancient and modern, that the Church is the servant of the State, and that both Pope and bishops should act, meet, deliberate and legislate only in conformity with the Imperial or Royal will. Here again St. Bernard stepped in to enlighten Louis VI., and to dissuade him from his purpose.

The Council of Pisa met on May 30, 1134. The Abbot of Clairvaux, who had faced and accomplished gigantic labors since he had parted with the Pope toward the close of 1132, hesitated not to cross the Alps once more, and to be at the Council of Pisa what he had been in those of Troyes and Rheims, the oracle of the assembled Fathers. Pope and Bishops seemed to have as much reverence for the man of God as the lowliest priest and layman. In the Council he spoke while all listened. Outside the Council, the monastery where he lodged was besieged night and day by the multitudes who came from far and near to consult him, to lay before him the wants and sores of soul and body.

"How describe the worshipful veneration of which he was the object," says his biographer, Ernaldus. "The crowd of persons ever anxious to see him was so great that the priests themselves had to wait the whole night at his door in order to be received in their turn. There was no end to those who went in and came out. So that this man, the very embodiment of humility, who would not allow that he was worthy of any honor, was not only burdened

with the affairs of the Church universal, but held as one clothed with the loftiest secular power."<sup>1</sup>

Then it was that Bernard resolved to extinguish the schism by facing its partisans in their chief strongholds. Clothed with the title of Legate á latere, and accompanied by two Cardinals and the Bishop of Chartres, he sets out for Milan. Here, again, the fame of his sanctity and the miracles which attested it preceded him at every stage of his journey. It was in vain that the powerful feudal nobles, who followed the leadership of Anselmo di Pusterla, tried to stir up the populations against the envoys of Innocent II. The popular heart, whose instincts in divining and acknowledging genuine holiness in man or woman, are infallible, had already been won. How could Bernard perform the prodigies which marked his every footstep on both sides of the Alps if God were not with him?

At his approach all Milan went out to greet him. The nobles and clergy were carried away in the stream of popular enthusiasm. He is soon surrounded by the worshipping crowd. The nearest kiss his hands, his feet, the very hem of his garments. Those farther off kneel and beseech his blessing. Nay, when he comes down from horseback, the pressure is so great that his cloak having fallen off it is immediately seized upon and torn into fragments by the crowd, "who," says his historian, "draw out the very threads of the cloth in order to bear home with them something that has belonged to the Saint."

Of course, under such circumstances it needed no long discourse to persuade the Milanese republicans that the cause for which the Abbot of Clairvaux was sent to them was the cause of God, that of the Church, that of the lawful Pope.

The very day after his arrival is marked by the miraculous cure of a woman who, for seven entire years, had been a prey to the terrible, demoniacal sufferings described in the Gospel. She had been brought into the presence of St. Bernard by a crowd of her fellow-citizens, who earnestly besought him to have pity on her. He at first hesitated, says his biographer, but seeing the ardent faith of the people around him, he knelt in prayer, and they knelt with him. The woman was cured instantaneously.

Another extraordinary cure was effected in the Basilica of St. Ambrose, and in the presence of the worshippers who filled it.

Anselmo di Pusterla had fled from the city. The Milanese, whose avidity to hear and see the holy man, drew the citizens of every degree and attached them to his footsteps, now began to wish that God might give them for chief pastor one whose golden elo-

---

<sup>1</sup> Ernaldus, lib. ii., cap. 2, n. 8.

quence and miracles reminded them of their own great St. Ambrose. One day when he was celebrating some solemn office in the Church of San Lorenzo, a voice suddenly shouted, "Bernard, Bernard for our Archbishop!" The cry was taken up by all present, and there was no stilling it. At length, the Saint told them that on the morrow they should have his decision. He should mount on horseback in their presence and leave the animal he rode to go his own way. If he remained in the city then they should be gratified. If the animal left the city behind, then they must be content to seek another man for their prelate.

On the morrow the animal the Abbot of Clairvaux rode started off at full gallop toward the gate leading to Pavia. The people, disappointed, bewailed their loss; but they remained true to Innocent II.

Bernard was to return later to the noble city of St. Ambrose, and to meet with a still more triumphant reception. But the image of the white-robed man of God, with his etherealized features all radiant with the light of another sphere, with those modest blue eyes of his which kindled all hearts with a fire from above when he spoke to them in the name of God, was a vision which never could fade from their souls.

Pavia and the other cities of upper Italy soon followed the example of Milan. Then the Pope sent Bernard across the Alps to Germany to reconcile Conrad and the other Hohenstauffen princes with the Emperor Lothaire, and thereby to extinguish in that country the last embers of the schism. From Germany the Saint was recalled to Pisa, his journey, going and returning, being one continuous series of ovations, marked everywhere by the conversion of sinners, by the revival among the people of a living faith and practical piety.

Innocent II., after the successful accomplishment of the Saint's mission to Germany, yielded to his entreaties and permitted him to return for a time to his beloved Clairvaux. But his path through Lombardy and Switzerland was beset by the eager multitudes whom the report of his passage drew together from every side. Flocks in the plains and herds high up on the flowery Alpine slopes were forsaken by their guardians, who could not, would not forego the opportunity of seeing the Messenger of God to the Christendom of the twelfth century. No one will be surprised to learn that in that distant age of bad roads slow travelling and intolerable hardships in traversing a whole continent, the worn-out frame of the Abbot of Clairvaux should have succumbed to all this succession of labor and endless journeyings.

In very truth as he left Geneva and turned himself toward Burgundy and Champagne, Bernard, scarcely able to keep his seat



on horseback with the aid of his companions, looked more like a dying man than one who had any prospect of living through the long years of trial which might await a man of forty-three.

Among his companions on this memorable return to Clairvaux was another Bernard, a Canon of Pisa, who yearned for the solitude and austerities of the Valley of Bitterness, and whom we shall presently meet again as Pope Eugenius III.

The monastery of Clairvaux was now too narrow for the numbers which the fame of its Abbot and the holy thirst for suffering and sanctity which he had kindled in the souls of the *élite* of the European youth, had attracted to the angelic life of the Cistercians. Besides, the site first chosen for the monastery was both insalubrious and unfavorable to the wide culture necessary toward feeding a large community of monks. So, yielding to the solicitations of the most experienced of his companions, Bernard consented to accept from the Count of Champagne another site with a wider range of cultivable lands and a better soil, and the second Clairvaux was built where the State Prison of that name stands in the France of 1890-91.

The half-hearted support given by the German Emperor to the lawful Pope and the powerful aid given, on the other hand, by Roger of Sicily to that of the anti-Pope, prolonged the schism till the death of Anacletus in the beginning of 1138. Meanwhile the Abbot of Clairvaux labored unceasingly to make of the new monastery built for himself and his community a spiritual paradise more marvellous even and more fragrant with the bloom of every supernatural virtue than had been their first blessed abode in the Vale of Bitterness. During these years of comparative repose the Saint, among other instructions daily delivered to his brethren, commented for them the Cantic of Canticles, with an elevation and purity of thought, with a most perfect chasteness of diction, which are worthy of the admiration of all ages. These sermons, preserved for us and all time by the painstaking monks of Clairvaux, should serve as a model to all commentators of Scripture, who presume to treat of the mysteries of Christ's love for His Church, and of the return made to Him for His unspeakable charity by that Church and by the privileged souls on whom He vouchsafes to bestow the divinest graces of His predilection. We have seen certain treatises of mystical theology and certain biographies of modern saints written with such a total disregard of what is due to innocent and virginal souls among their readers, that it is hard to look upon their books in any other light than that they are a calamity.

The sermons of St. Bernard, a Doctor of Holy Church and the last of the Fathers, ought to satisfy even the most learned, and

teach the most experienced in spirituality how to treat holily of the holiest things.

Toward the middle of 1137 the Emperor Lothaire, whose title was challenged by the warlike and skilful King of Sicily, resolved to return to Italy with an army which should bear down all resistance, while compelling Roger II. and his adherents to do homage to the Imperial Crown and to acknowledge Innocent II. as the sole legitimate Pontiff. This would, the Emperor thought, end all divisions in Church and State. But Lothaire, ever intent on obtaining from the Pope the concession of the right of *investiture* and such privileges as would leave the spiritual power at the mercy of the temporal, was determined to wrest from Innocent II. in his extremity the rights so long contested or denied. This, Innocent was well apprised of, and as St. Bernard had been the most efficient auxiliary of the Holy See in defeating Lothaire's former pretensions, so the Saint was now summoned once more to Italy. This time also Bernard's presence in the opposite camps, and his eloquence in dealing with the churchmen, statesmen and warriors who upheld the cause of Anacletus served most efficaciously, under the divine blessing, toward the victory of right and the pacification of the Church.

In the last battle between the Sicilian and the Imperial forces, the Abbot of Clairvaux betook himself to a neighboring monastery, where he ceased not to pray, till, against all expectations, the Sicilians were utterly routed. The victory was attributed, on both sides, to the prayers of the Saint, who also prevailed on King Roger to have the rival claims of Pope and anti-Pope discussed in public conference at Salerno. There, again, the eloquence of St. Bernard, inspired by his ardent faith, triumphed over the arguments of Peter of Pisa, the great orator of the schismatics, whose wonderful discourse seemed to have carried away the very supporters of Innocent.

No one ventured to reply to the Saint, who, taking Peter of Pisa by the hand, led him to the feet of the lawful Pope. Roger of Sicily still hesitated, when the death of Anacletus, forsaken by his own partisans, ended this long schism of eight years' duration. The anti-Pope, Victor IV., whom the schismatic Cardinals selected in the place of Anacletus, soon gave up his pretensions, and was pardoned by Innocent.

"On the eighth day after Pentecost," writes St. Bernard to his brethren of Clairvaux, "God crowned all my wishes, by giving unity to the Church and peace to Rome. On that day, all who had favored the schism of Pietro de Leone (Anacletus) came to kneel before the pope, and swear to him fidelity and obedience. . . . What joy this event caused the Roman people! For some time past I had foreseen this issue. And the hope of it kept me

far away from you. Nothing now requires me to stay in Rome. . . . So I return to you. I leave this rewarded for all my labors. Christ has conquered, and the Church is pacified.”<sup>1</sup>

The General Council of Lateran, held by the Pope in 1139, fulfilled one of the most cherished desires of the Abbot of Clairvaux, the reform of the clergy. If one looks back from the year 1139, down to the days of Constantine the Great, it will be seen, on perusing the acts of each succeeding Pontificate, how large a space is taken up by the records of the uninterrupted battle of the Popes and the Catholic hierarchy everywhere against the usurpations of imperial and kingly power, which, while pretending to protect the Church, labored persistently to take away from her and her ministers everything that resembled true liberty and independent action, even in spirituals. Feudalism, after the invasion of the barbarians, only contributed to make more intolerable the yoke imposed by Cæsarism. Century after century, the powers of this world practically denied to the Church the proper freedom of action essential to a society constituted by Christ Himself, and holding its authority from Him. And the Cæsarism of feudalism, which oppressed the Church, encouraged, fostered, protected in the clergy the vices condemned by the Gospel, and reprovèd by the decrees of the succeeding Councils.

Every Pope, during his Pontificate, had to fight with Cæsar, king, and feudal lord, for the very life proper of the Church of Christ, while his efforts to reform the morals of cloister and sanctuary met with invincible resistance from the great of this world, whose sons were thrust, perforce, into all high stations and offices of honor and emolument. The Pope, during each successive reign, was like a man continually called to defend his house against brigands, or to extinguish the flames kindled by incendiaries. What time or opportunity had he to attend to its external or internal beauty and order, when his whole strength was wasted in repairing the breaches committed by the foe, in protecting the lives and liberty of his family, and in keeping a roof above them?

When Innocent II., after getting possession of Rome and extinguishing a long and disastrous schism, attempted to reform the clergy, he met with but little assistance from the reigning sovereigns of Christendom.

While the Council of Lateran was sitting in the cathedral church of the Popes, the king of Sicily, relieved from the presence of the Imperial armies, had repossessed himself of the kingdom of Naples and all southern Italy, and was threatening Rome itself and the patrimony of St. Peter.

Innocent II., who, it must be said, was getting tired of the aid and counsels of St. Bernard, collected an army, marched against

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter 317, quoted by Chevallier.



the Sicilian monarch, who took the Pope prisoner, and wrung from his captive an acknowledgment of his sovereignty over all the dominions held by his arms.

But even then, Roger proclaimed openly that in submitting to Innocent as the lawful successor of St. Peter, he was only yielding to the salutary influence exercised over him by the words and saintly example of the Abbot of Clairvaux. He solicited from the Pope the favor of having a colony of Cistercians in Sicily, and Innocent willingly yielded to his prayer.

Thus Sicily was blessed, as Portugal had lately been, as Milan and all Lombardy would soon be, by the possession of these sons of St. Bernard, who would effect at Alcobaça, Chiaravalle, and Morimondo, what they had achieved in the Valley of Bitterness—make the desert bloom like the springtide of Eden, and fill the cloister with the virtues of the angelic spheres. Now is the time to tell a too forgetful age that it is to the Cistercian recluses that Lombardy, and all upper Italy, owe the culture which transformed the land from a marshy wilderness and unproductive upland waste into a region of waving cornfields and fruitful vineyards, literally flowing with milk and honey; the home of agriculture, and every peaceful industry, where a faithful, pious, liberty-loving people made every foot of God's earth beautiful, every one of their cities the cradle of learning, art, and song, every one of its teeming homes the dwelling of laborious, thrifty, contented freemen. Let Cesare Cantù teach Europe what it owes to the sons of St. Bernard; Mariana and his brother-historians will also tell us what marvellous changes in agriculture, even, these poor, despised monks wrought in the Portugal of Affonso-Henriquez, as well as in the Sicily of Roger II.

If there is decay in France, in Italy, in Spain, and Portugal, the historian may trace the beginning and progress of such decay to the decline of the virtues which St. Bernard and his glorious disciples taught by word and example, wherever they were left free to exercise an influence the most salutary ever felt by the generations of mankind.

It is the influence of the supernatural Gospel virtues. Let governments favor and foster to-morrow the men who inherit the spirit of St. Bernard, and you will see Burgundy, Champagne, and all France, renew their Christian youth, and repeat the heroic achievements of the twelfth century. Let the divine freemasonry of self-sacrifice be allowed to do its work in the Italian and the Iberian peninsulas; let Christian Faith, and Hope, and Charity, be encouraged once more to speak to our modern generations of toilers, to elevate their aims and their lives above the low level of the prevailing naturalism and egotism, and the world shall behold beautiful Italy repeating the history of her mediæval wonders; Spain and Portu-

gal reascending to the level of the prosperity and greatness from which they fell by allowing irreligion to poison all the springs of their social life.

Distant Ireland, at the western extremity of Europe, had heard long before 1138 of the fame of St. Bernard. And Ireland, since the days of St. Patrick, had never ceased to yearn for that supernatural life with which the name of Clairvaux was identified.

During the summer of 1138, the successor of St. Patrick, Malachy, Archbishop of Armagh, knocked one day at the gate of the new Clairvaux. He was on his way to Rome to ask the pallium from Innocent II., the successor of that Celestine who, in the fifth century had sent Patrick to evangelize the Celts of Erin. On his way through Gaul, the venerable pilgrim had turned aside to the abode of St. Bernard, drawn to that great kindred soul by the magnetism of sanctity. Malachy also hungered and thirsted insatiably for that life of sublime self-sacrifice taught and practiced in Clairvaux. The first meeting of the two Saints bound their souls together in a friendship which was to live forever.

From Clairvaux the Archbishop sped to Rome buoyed up by a great hope. He besought Innocent II. to allow him to lay aside the burden of his episcopal dignity and to become at Clairvaux the last and lowliest of the Cistercian novices. But Innocent knew too well how much Ireland, so long desolated by the heathen and ferocious Danes, and even in 1138 still coveted by the Northmen who had conquered England, needed such holy pastors as Malachy. So his petition was refused. One consolation was left the great Archbishop as he returned, disappointed but submissive, to his church beyond the seas, that he might soon possess in the Isle of Saints a colony of Cistercians. For this purpose, on arriving in Armagh, he selected among the clerical youth around him several of the most fervent and promising, whom he sent to Clairvaux. There they were carefully trained by the great master of spiritual life, and when they had made their religious profession, they were sent back to Malachy with the blessing of his friend. How it fared with them, and what plentiful fruit they bore on that soil, where all the flowers of holiness blossom and ripen under God's most special grace, we need not tell the reader.

Malachy, ere he quitted Clairvaux, had obtained permission to wear the white Cistercian robes. He had always emulated in his conduct the virtues which distinguished Citeaux. In 1148 St. Malachy, who still yearned for the life of the cloister and the companionship of his twin soul, St. Bernard, once more reappeared at Clairvaux. This time the Archbishop of Armagh was sustained by a new hope. There then sat on the chair of Peter Eugenius III., that same Bernard of Pisa whom the Abbot of Clairvaux had formed with such fatherly care till he sent him to Rome at the head

of the colony of Cistercians whom the Pope wished to establish in the Eternal City. On Bernard of Pisa the choice of the Sacred College fell in 1145, at the death of Lucius II.

Would not a Cistercian Pope, the favorite disciple of the Abbot of Clairvaux, favor the suit of Malachy, and allow him to end his days in the cloister where Eugenius had himself spent his happiest days?

The yearning of the gentle Irish saint was to be satisfied at length, though in a way he little anticipated. He arrived in Clairvaux footsore and wearied. The joy of meeting his friend, the more than brother of his soul, and the happiness of breathing once more an atmosphere redolent of Heaven, made the aged prelate forget, at first, the fatigues of his long journey across sea and land. But the end had come for him. One supreme happiness on this side of the grave was vouchsafed him,—to die clothed with the white tunic of Clairvaux, with St. Bernard by his side, and ministered to in his last hours by the loving hands of those whom he had longed to call by the sweet name of brothers.

On the very evening of the day which witnessed the departure from earth of that saintly soul, the Abbot of Clairvaux made of this most edifying death the subject of his homily to the monks:

"We must see a special design of Providence in His permitting Malachy to die in our midst," the Abbot says. "It was by a favor of Heaven that he thus fulfilled the wish so often expressed of closing his life here. He came from the ends of the earth to put off his mortal coil in this house. This was the secret hope which he so fondly cherished when he set out on the long journey that ended at Clairvaux.

"On his arrival we welcomed him as if he were God's angel, so deep was the veneration which the holy man inspired. He, on his side, impelled by his charity and his characteristic modesty and gentleness, lavished on us the marks of a friendship which we did not deserve. . . .

"It remains for us to deplore the cruel death which, in cutting off this one man, inflicts such a loss on the whole Church. Cruel indeed and pitiless is death which causes our tears to flow so abundantly; blind and undiscerning is that death which froze the tongue of Malachy, paralyzed his feet, struck down his hands, and closed forever these eyes which were wont to fascinate the sinner and draw him to the sweet joys of repentance. These blessed hands of his never ceased from austere labor save when they offered up in sacrifice the Victim of our salvation, or were raised in supplication toward the throne of mercy. Blessed hands, that showered so many graces on the sick and the needy, and were the instruments of so many miracles. Blessed feet, so beautiful on the hills of Erin as they bore everywhere the Gospel of Christ; feet so often



wearied with their apostolic journeyings, and whose prints on the earth we should kiss with devout rapture. Blessed those priestly lips which were the guardians of knowledge; blessed the mouth of the just man who meditated science ere he poured forth its treasures, and blessed the tongue whose every utterance was a benediction and a consolation. . . .

"Let us congratulate, O brethren, this father of ours as it now bescemeth us. If filial piety impels us to weep over Malachy dead, a higher piety should prompt us to rejoice with Malachy living. Yes, he truly liveth. He is everlastingly the fellow-citizen of the saints, and the most happy inmate of God's own household on high."<sup>1</sup>

We have in this extract a sample of the style of St. Bernard's addresses when some great loss deeply touched his heart, and made it pour forth in unpremeditated eloquence the sentiments which filled it to overflowing. St. Malachy had expressed before dying the wish that he should be buried in the poor, white tunic of the Cistercians, as the lowliest of the community, a member of which he had ever yearned to be. But St. Bernard would not permit the successor of St. Patrick, the Primate of a Church so renowned as that of Ireland, to be consigned to the grave like a brother of Clairvaux. The body of the Saint was clothed in pontifical vestments, a solemn funeral service was performed, and all that was earthly of Malachy was put in a tomb in the chancel of the monastery church. Later, Bernard himself, on his death-bed, directed that he should be buried by the side of Malachy. The poor, white tunic in which the Irish Archbishop died the Abbot of Clairvaux kept for himself as a relic and a treasure beyond price. When in August, 1153, five years after the death of his friend, the great Doctor of the twelfth century, lay at death's door, the brilliant light of God's House upon earth as it was about to be extinguished forever, Bernard asked for the tunic of Malachy, was clad in it, and in it received the last Sacraments of the Church, and breathed his gentle and mighty spirit into the bosom of his Maker. Who can doubt that Malachy's glorified spirit stood invisibly by that bedside; by the side of the hard pallet on which expired the most wonderful man ever born within the limits of ancient Gaul or modern France?

By the side of St. Malachy's tomb the weeping monks of Clairvaux raised another for their great parent. Both shrines were in the very shadow of the Altar on which Christ descended in the morning sacrifice, and on which He dwelt in His sacramental Presence evermore. Both tombs were the united object of veneration to the inmates of the monastery and the population far and wide.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sermon on the day of St. Malachy's death, nn. 3-5.

The two sepulchres were rifled by the French Revolutionists of 1793, and their contents cast forth into one indiscriminate heap. Thus the ashes of the saintly dead were mingled together. A pious monk of Clairvaux, however, gathered up these precious remains, which, after various vicissitudes, are now enshrined in the not far distant church of Ville-sous-La Ferté. Several well-authenticated portions of the relics of St. Bernard, together with what time has spared of the hard pallet on which he died, and a portion of the chasuble worn by him at the altar, are at present enclosed in a magnificent shrine at Fontaine-les-Dijon.

As we mentioned in a preceding article, the heads of both St. Malachy and St. Bernard belong to the Cathedral Church of Troyes, where pilgrims venerate them side by side in the same beautiful reliquary.

Are not these remains of the saints a pledge that France and Ireland shall ever be united in the Faith, and united as well in undying friendship? Shall we not believe that no violence of the persecutor, no length of time, shall ever extinguish in the Green Isle or the Kingdom of St. Louis the religion glorified by the lives of St. Malachy of Armagh and St. Bernard of Clairvaux?

O sister nations, bound to each other through the centuries by the ties of a love God-given, who shall separate you now from HIM or from each other? O Churches, united so long by sympathies stronger than those of blood or earthly interest, how the hearts of your exiles go forth to you from beyond the seas in the deep and bitter trials which assail you. A thousand grateful and glorious memories ever live in the land of St. Malachy recalling what France did or dared for Ireland in the darkest hours of her need. The very mention of France has still power to move the Irish heart. Nor has the decline of the Catholic faith among so many Frenchmen killed in their souls the traditional sympathy with suffering Ireland. But among the believing millions of St. Bernard's countrymen the love of Catholic Ireland, ever suffering and ever true to the ancient faith, is still a religion for the French heart in its incomparable generosity.

Oh! that the clouds of distress were lifted from sorely-trying Ireland in the year of grace 1891, instead of lowering so terribly on a people threatened chronically with famine and extermination; how gladly would the children of the Green Isle flock to France to celebrate the eighth centenary of St. Bernard's birth. How they, too, would glory in contributing to restore to somewhat of its former splendor the Sanctuary at Fontaines-les-Dijon, where was born the great son of the Blessed Alèthe de Montbard and Blessed Tescelin-le-Roux.

## THE ORIGIN OF THE GREAT SCHISM OF THE WEST.

1. "Le Grand Schisme d'Occident d'après les documents contemporains déposées aux archives secrètes du Vatican : par M. l'abbé Louis Gayet, chapelain de Saint Louis des Français. Tomes I.-II., Les Origines." Florence and Berlin, 1889.
2. "Conciliengeschichte nach den Quellen bearbeitet : von Carl Joseph von Hefelé : Band VI. ; zweite vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage, besorgt von Dr. Alois Knöpfler. Freiburg im Breisgau, 1890.

BENEDICT XIV. does not hesitate in his work on the "Canonization of the Saints"<sup>1</sup> to attach to the Popes who resided in Avignon during the deplorable schism of the West the stigma of *Pseudo-pontificum Avinionensium*. Had the great Lambertini thus pronounced in his capacity of Head of the Church speaking *ex cathedra*, we should acquiesce very cheerfully in a judgment which is historically probable ; and we should conclude with Palma (c. 32) and the body of Italian historians, that "there is no longer any doubt that Urban VI. was legitimately elected," and that "unquestionably the line of lawful Pontiffs has been continued through him and his successors." But since Benedict XIV. wrote his immortal work as a private theologian, his views on the controversy are worth no more than are the arguments with which he enforces them ; and in our humble opinion his arguments tell rather against him. For, first, if Martin V. had regarded Bonifacius IX. or John XXIII. as lawful Popes he would scarcely have proceeded *ad cautelam* to a third canonization of St. Bridget ; and, second, if Pius II., at a period considerably later, had been as certain about the lawful succession as Benedict professes to be, why should he have pronounced it providential that the canonization of St. Catharine of Siena had been postponed until the re-establishment of peace ?

"The darkness is now dispelled," says Lambertini,<sup>2</sup> but what "clear light" has newly arisen to dispel it ? What facts relating to the tumultuous scenes enacted in Rome in April, 1378, was he, or are we possessed of which were not equally and far more vividly and more painfully present to the perplexed minds of the

<sup>1</sup> Book i., c. 9, n. 10.

<sup>2</sup> "Depulsa temporum caligine, in clara luce hodie positum est, legitimum jus Pontificatus penes Urbanum VI. ejusque successores Bonifacium IX. Innocentium VII., etc., stetit." Ubi supra.



Fathers of Constance and of the doctors and canonists of the fifteenth century? As well might we say that our countrymen four hundred years from now will be in better condition than we are to pass judgment upon the contested election of Messrs. Tilden and Hayes. All that can fairly be concluded is that as time has rolled on the Italians have grown bolder and are become more and more disposed to condone and extenuate the outrageous violence concededly done by their ancestors to a sacred college composed mainly of French cardinals; and in their admiration for the old watchword, "*Romano lo volemo o Italiano*," they pass lightly over the gross illegalities committed in order to secure its triumph.

Gibbon, with his habitual "philosopher's smile," suggests that the "ordinal numbers of the popes seem to decide the question against Clement VII. and Benedict XIII."<sup>1</sup> In other words, those Popes who in after times selected the name of Urban, or Innocent, or Gregory, or even Alexander, respected the titles of the Roman and Pisan contestants, whereas the Clements and the Benedicts ignored the existence of the Popes of Avignon. But the circumstance, while it proves (that which is otherwise perfectly certain) that the Italians have consistently adhered to their first choice, Urban VI. does not constitute a dogmatic fact which can modify the state of the controversy. The catalogue of the Popes is not an official document of the Catholic Church. As Gayet justly observes, St. Leo IX. ought, properly speaking, to be called Leo VIII., for the Leo VIII. of the list was notoriously an anti-Pope. For a similar reason Boniface VIII. ought to have been called Boniface VII. (or more likely Boniface VI.).<sup>2</sup> This argument, therefore, carries no weight, nor can it have any influence upon a critical mind in forming an opinion on the question. At the time of the Council of Constance the three competitors were equally regarded as *doubtful Popes*, and *de jure* such they will most probably ever remain. The anxiety of Italian writers to snatch at hasty phrases like that of Benedict XIV. and to appeal to the vague *sensus ecclesiæ*, instead of standing firmly upon the evidence of history betrays a nervous trepidation as to the clear justice of their cause.

Indeed, to us (an American Catholic who can feel no sympathy with either Frenchmen or Italians in their petty national jealousies) it has always seemed that the weakest point in the armor of the Italians is their insisting that we should rule out of court the sworn depositions of the cardinal electors, and look upon an entire sacred college as made up of unprincipled and unscrupulous

---

<sup>1</sup> C. 70

<sup>2</sup> Gayet, p. xvii.

hypocrites, perjurers and villains. We may surely be pardoned if we pronounce that such a conclusion is revolting alike to our loyal Catholic faith and to our belief in the substantial integrity of human nature. Among them all, ward-politicians, mobs, cardinals and Papal candidates, they made a pretty mess of it, and they came as near to destroying the Church of God as it is possible for human agency to come. But give them all their due. They were all deeply in earnest. There were many sides to the question, and each party was thoroughly sincere in looking exclusively and narrow-mindedly only at *one* side. The Romans had registered a vow in heaven that the Bishop of Rome should be a Roman "*o almanco Italiano.*" The sacred college was equally resolved not to submit to the dictation of an Italian mob. Urban, when elected *taliter qualiter* and enthroned, determined, in spite of his unstable foothold, that he would show himself from the very first day every inch a Pope. Such being the respective dispositions of the interested parties, what wonder is it that there ensued a "*schisma omnium schismatum, quæ ante fuerunt, pessimum et subtilissimum?*" Let us content ourselves with reproaching them all that they were not solicitous to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. But let us regard them, not as fiends, but as human beings, encompassed indeed with human weaknesses, but actuated throughout by the motives which are wont to appeal to human nature. Had not all the actors in the lamentable tragedy been so deadly in earnest the dissension might have been healed in a very short time. The turbulent conclave of 1378 was but child's play in point of confusion and disorder, if compared with many another in the preceding history of Papal elections. That which gave to this particular election its fatal distinction was the international interest which it excited. The long residence of the Popes in Avignon (so foolishly styled by many their Babylonish captivity) had vastly enhanced the dignity of the Papacy by disentangling it from the shackles of a degraded and decayed municipality and by divulging the great secret that the city of Rome was of slight importance when compared with the Church of God.<sup>1</sup> The "Bishop of Rome," "the Primate of Italy," the "Patriarch of the West," the "Head of the Church," had for upwards of seventy years got along wonderfully well without the "Eternal City;" but Rome had meanwhile become a veritable Ichabod,—her glory had departed. It was not her chief misfortune that she had shrunk to the humble proportions of a provincial town; that her basilicas stood roofless;

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Tacitus, *Histor. Lib. I., c. 4.* "*Evulgato imperii arcano posse principem alibi quam Romæ fieri,*"

and that her ancient monuments had become the lairs of wild beasts and of wilder brigands. It was a far keener humiliation that Christendom was now disenchanted respecting the eternity and indestructibility of her charms, and looked on at her frenzied and Rienzied attempts to resuscitate the defunct Mistress of the World with amusement rather than pity. This utter degradation and desolation of the capital of Christendom was the just and long-delayed retribution for the ungovernable fury and intolerable petulance of its inhabitants who seemed to grow more and more barbarous as the ages went on. A careful and minute study of the dates of papal documents has enabled Gayet to show that of the two hundred and four years which elapsed between A.D. 1100 and A.D. 1304, the year previous to the election of the first Pope of Avignon, the Supreme Pontiffs had been in intermittent exile from their See for a period aggregating one hundred and twenty-two years, that is, forty years in excess of the total space of time they had spent during those two centuries in Rome. Nor did they finally abandon the city of St. Peter with the deliberate purpose not to return. When Clement V., after several migrations, established himself in Avignon, this town did not belong to the Holy See, and the Pope remained until death the guest of the Dominicans. When the septuagenarian Bishop of Avignon was chosen as Clement's successor in the Papacy, it was but natural that he should continue to reside in his humble episcopal residence, where, as John XXII. he gained immortal renown by his towering genius, his indefatigable energy and his crotchety pugnaciousness. It was only the third of the Avignonese Pontiffs, Benedict XII., who, after making an ineffectual attempt to find a lodgment in Italy, finally ordered the erection of a new pontifical palace on the banks of the Rhone. The "captivity" of the Holy See might seem to be settled beyond redemption when the next Pope, Clement VI. purchased the sovereignty of Avignon from Queen Joan of Naples at the very time, A.D., 1348, when Rienzi was playing his mad pranks on the shores of the Tiber.

Thus, we see, it took the Popes upwards of forty years to become acclimated in Avignon, and, strange to say, they began forthwith to pave the way for a return to their ancient capital. In 1353, Pope Innocent VI. despatched the great warrior-statesman, Cardinal Alborno, into Italy with legatine powers and a small army, with the view to the restoration of order and of the Papal authority throughout the ruined patrimony of the Church. This gigantic task engaged the vigor and abilities of the legate during the nine remaining years of Innocent's pontificate. In the conclave of 1362, Alborno modestly declined the proffered tiara; and delivered up to the new Vicar of Christ a wagon-load of keys of the towns and



fortresses which he had re-conquered by his address or by force of arms. Blessed Urban V. immediately formed the design of returning to Rome; announced his intention to the Christian world in 1366; and in spite of the strenuous opposition of Charles V. of France and the murmurs of his doubting and reluctant cardinals, embarked at Marseilles on May 19, 1367. The unbounded and unbridled enthusiasm of his first reception by the Italians was soon succeeded by the usual street-brawls and faction fights, in one of which the Pope and his cardinals narrowly escaped with their lives, and in all of which they felt that the apostolic dignity was insulted and outraged. After a three years' sojourn in different parts of his dominion, Blessed Urban determined that he should endure it no longer; and, in spite of the earnest warnings of St. Bridget, he returned to Avignon and died the death of the just, December 19, 1370.

One would have supposed that this humiliating failure of a wise and saintly Pope would have effectually deterred his successors from again entrusting their personal safety and their pontifical dignity to the tender mercies of an Italian mob. Yet the very next Pontiff, Gregory XI., conceived the heroic resolution to repeat the perilous attempt. What were the considerations which influenced him? The Italian writers supply him with one set of motives, the French writers with another. Fortunate Pope Gregory! Both nations represent thee to have been a young man of sincere piety and stainless integrity. Would that the chattering tongue of gossip had dealt as lightly with the characters of all the members of thy august dynasty! And yet, what charge advanced by Italians or Protestants against the Popes of Avignon is better established than this; that Clement VI., the purchaser of Avignon, made thee a cardinal at the absurdly premature age of eighteen and loaded thee down with an accumulation of succulent benefices, simply because thou wast his nephew!

Cardinal Pierre Roger, the Italians tell us, was a man infinitely above the intellectual and moral level of his colleagues. So conspicuous were his merits that he received the unanimous votes of the Sacred College on the very first day of the conclave.<sup>1</sup> Roger, deploring the degradation of the Papacy and the widowhood of Rome, had made a secret vow that, in case he should be the choice of the cardinals, he would at any cost re-establish the Holy See near the tomb of the Apostle. As Gregory XI., however, he allowed this vow to slumber long in his bosom. Indeed, his first great official act was probably the most misguided and disastrous

<sup>1</sup> We have never been able satisfactorily to reconcile the phenomenon that the "wicked" Cardinals of Avignon almost invariably selected most excellent Popes with the great law of nature that *omne animal creat simile sibi*.

to the Church of any which has ever emanated from a Vicar of Christ; for he elevated to the Cardinalate those eighteen Frenchmen who are responsible for the Great Schism. After six years of Pontificate he was roused from his lethargy by the fervent exhortations (enforced by prophecies, revelations and miracles) of St. Catharine of Siena; and on September 13, 1376, after surmounting very formidable obstacles, he discharged his personal vow and his prime official duty by bidding, and forcing his unwilling Court to bid, Avignon an eternal farewell.

The writers of the opposite party while admitting that the words and miracles of the saintly Florentine virgin exercised a great influence upon the mind of Pope Gregory, draw our attention to the following considerations. First, it can scarcely be true that the Pope definitively abandoned Avignon; for he left behind him his Chancellor, the Cardinal of Pampeluna, and five other cardinals, viz.: Albano, Boulogne, Nîmes, Mende and St. Martial. Why did he thus imitate the prudent Jacob in dividing his flock, unless he harbored a strong presentiment that his sojourn in Rome, like that of his predecessor would be brief and stormy?<sup>1</sup>

Secondly, although ten years is a very short period in the life of a civilized nation, yet ten years used to be amply sufficient to transform the ever-varying features of Mediæval Italy. In the year 1376 the Italy of 1366 existed no longer. The work of Alborno was completely undone. The old tyrants, the old communes, the old factions were again in the ascendant. The provinces of the Papal states had one after another renounced their allegiance and were leagued with Florence in a bitter warfare against the legates of the Pontiff. Rome was wavering as to its political course, but had finally determined either to force the Holy Father to take up his residence in the city of St. Peter or elect a new spiritual chief-tain. Pope Gregory was informed of the disposition of the Romans by the missives of his legate, the Cardinal of St. Peter, and still more impressively by a solemn embassy sent by the senate and people of Rome, whose spokesman, Luke Savelli, "exhorted, conjured and finally summoned" the Vicar of Christ to transfer the Papal court to its proper seat. That the Romans were deeply in earnest there could be no doubt. Their choice of an anti-Pope had been made; it was the powerful Abbot of Monte

<sup>1</sup> When Urban VI. summoned the commandant of Castle St. Angelo to surrender that fortress, the latter refused, alleging that Gregory "injunxit mihi sub pena excommunicationis et perditionis ac maledictionis suæ, nulli deberem assignare castrum sine consensu cardinalium degentium ultra montes." See his deposition ap. Gayet, I., P. J., 167. If this valiant warrior is not lying, his testimony is an interesting revelation of Pope Gregory's mental attitude; and affords a satisfactory explanation of the Pope's action in leaving his chancellor and one-fourth of the Sacred College out of the reach of the Romans.

Cassino ; and he had accepted the dubious honor, saying : " I am a Roman citizen, and place myself at the disposal of my countrymen."<sup>1</sup>

Pope Gregory's journey to Rome was undertaken, therefore, in the estimation of Gallic writers, under far sadder auspices than that of Blessed Urban. He entered upon it with a heavy heart, compelled by dire necessity, and with the view to avert that very schism which his premature resolution made all the more disastrous and incurable. Had the Romans carried out their nefarious plan, the schism would have been circumscribed within the tottering walls of their city, and their anti-Pope would soon have wended his way to the feet of the lawful Pontiff to seek forgiveness in sackcloth and ashes. By imprudently putting himself and a majority of the Sacred College, in the power of the Roman populace, Gregory XI. became the unconscious author of evils which he lived long enough to foresee and deplore, but not long enough to prevent.

How easy it is to build historical theories, and to give useless advice to dead kings and Popes !

Pope Gregory, evidently, did not place excessive confidence in St. Catharine's political prophecy, that " his rebellious lambs would hasten to his paternal lap." He sent forward, to secure himself a foothold, an army of Bretons, estimated by different writers as between 6000 and 14,000 men, under the command of Cardinal Robert of Geneva, who was destined to figure subsequently as Clement VII.

The Holy Father arrived in Marseilles on the 22d of September, 1376, and found in waiting the squadrons of the Genoese, the Pisans, and of Queen Joan of Naples. Embarking on October 2d, he succeeded, after a very tempestuous voyage which wrecked many of his ships, in making the port of Genoa on the 18th. Detained by contrary winds, he persisted in his journey, and celebrated the feast of Christmas in Corneto, where he was met by the ambassadors of the Romans, and presented with a document assuring him the full and absolute dominion of his capital. Continuing his voyage by sea, he sailed up the Tiber and arrived in Rome, January 17, 1377. Mediæval rhetoric confesses itself unequal to the task of describing the glories of that day ; the magnificence of the pageantry ; the blare of the trumpets, drowned by the louder acclamations of a countless multitude ; the interminable procession

<sup>1</sup> " Haec autem concepta malitia non latuit, quando per eorum ambaxiatores abati Cassinensi eorum concivi fuerit nunciatum ; si papatum, in casu quo per clerum et populum romanum sibi daretur, veliet accipere. Qui ultra se offerens respondit : Se civem romanum esse et illud velle quod ipsi vellent."—Deposition of Petr. Rostaing, ap. Gayet, I. P., G., 157 ; quoted also by Gibbon from Baluze.



of bishops and clergy, of magistrates, barons, guilds, and confraternities, all decked in their gayest ornaments of silk and gold. "Never had Rome witnessed a more solemn spectacle, never had she so great a reason to rejoice."<sup>1</sup>

But this honeymoon of the long-widowed city was of short duration. Life was intolerably monotonous to the barons and populace of those days unless seasoned with frequent revolutions.<sup>2</sup>

The Romans speedily forgot, or regretted, their pledge to acknowledge the "full and absolute dominion" of the Pöpe; and whilst the Papal representative, the Senator, was the nominal executive of the city, the real power was vested in the popular Bannerets.<sup>3</sup>

Pope Gregory, who had devoted the early years of his Pontificate to the noble task of establishing harmony among the great nations of Europe, soon wearied of the undignified and barren labor of endeavoring to keep order in a city of thirty thousand unruly inhabitants, and he sighed for the quiet of Avignon all the more ardently because he felt that the painful and remorseless disease, the stone, from which he was suffering, must soon carry him to an untimely grave. Upon the approach of summer he expressed a desire to exchange the sweltering city for the purer air of Anagni; but we are informed by a Spanish prelate, then present in the Papal court,<sup>4</sup> he could obtain this favor from the Romans only by promising solemnly that he would, *infallibiliter et protinus*, return to the city in the autumn. Return he did, on the 18th of October, and the Romans having heard a rumor that he had it in contemplation to go back to Avignon, resolved they would never again trust him outside of their gates. They were soon relieved of this solicitude by the alarming conditon of Gregory's health. In the beginning of the fatal year, 1378, it became apparent to every one that his days were numbered.

What were thy thoughts, O venerable Pontiff, as thou layest, writhing with pain upon thy death-bed? Wast thou sensible how many weighty interests were depending from the slender thread of thy feeble life? Didst thou regard thy premature death as a divine judgment upon thee? if so, what had been thy fault? Here enter again the contending gossips of French and Italians, who have

<sup>1</sup> Capecelatro, Storia di S. Catarina, p. 272.

<sup>2</sup> "Ma questo sereno non durò molto. Troppo in secoli tali erano avezzi i baroni e i popoli tutti alle rivoluzioni."—Muratori, Annali d' Italia. Anno 1377.

<sup>3</sup> These Bannerets (Lat., *bandarenenses* or *banderarii*, Ital., *bandaresti*), who played so prominent a part in the conclave of 1378, were the twelve *caporioni*, or chiefs of quarters. "Hi banderarii proprio sermone a vexillis, quæ ante se gerebant, dicebantur, a quibus singulorum curiæ internoscebantur."—Ap. Du Cange sub voce.

<sup>4</sup> Eymeric, inquisitor of Aragon.

sought to make capital for their cause even out of the lamentable death of this Pope, the most disastrous occurrence recorded in church history.

"When he was drawing towards his end," says the Bishop of Rieti, "and all hope of life and recovery was abandoned, he himself recognized that his untimely death was a Divine infliction; forasmuch as he had resolved to abandon his proper See."<sup>1</sup> So runs the Italian version.

Now hear the other side. Gerson, to point his moral that we should not be over-credulous in listening to prophecies and revelations, adduces the instance of Pope Gregory, "who learned this lesson when it was too late. For when he was on his death-bed he held in his hands the sacred Body of Christ, and admonished the assistants to beware of those, men or women, who, upon pretext of religion, wove visions out of their own heads. 'I myself,' said he, 'led astray by such persons against my better judgment, have brought the Church into imminent danger of schism, unless her merciful Spouse, Jesus, shall guard over her.'"<sup>2</sup>

We do not wish our readers to attach the slightest historical importance to either of these conflicting reports of Pope Gregory's dying sentiments. They are samples of that Plutarchian system of weaving history out of unauthenticated anecdotes, which makes fascinating reading for women and children. It is the method usually adopted by the enemies of the Church, and has been a very effective weapon in the hands of veteran heretics. A far more trustworthy revelation of Gregory's anxieties and forebodings is afforded by the bull which he promulgated the eighth day before his death for the regulation of the approaching conclave. In this document he annuls the ordinances of his predecessors regarding the mode of holding a papal election, and permits his cardinals to choose the time and place, at the discretion of the majority of those present at court, even against the will of the minority. He exhorts them to lose no time in providing the Church of God with a worthy Pastor. It is impossible to read this extraordinary decree,

<sup>1</sup> Dum in extremis ageret, jamque de vita et sanitate quodam modo desperaret ipse recognovit se Dei judicio idcirco morte præveniri quoniam sedem propriam relinquere determinaverat." Quoted by Gayet, i., 27, from Baluze, to whose work on the Popes of Avignon we have been unable to obtain access. We take this opportunity to express our regret that our American libraries, overcrowded as they are with modern compilations, are so defective in providing the historical student with that which he chiefly desires, the original documents of the story.

<sup>2</sup> "Hic positus in extremis, habens in manibus sacrum Christi corpus, protestatus est coram omnibus ut caverent ab hominibus, sive viris sive mulieribus sub specie religionis loquentibus visiones sui capitis; quia per tales ipse seductus, dimisso rationabili consilio, traxerat se et Ecclesiam ad discrimen schismatis imminentis, nisi misericors provideret sponsus Jesus." We quote the text (not having Gerson's treatise) from Capececiatello *Storia di S. Catarina*, p. 313.

which abolished the two-third's rule and the nine days' delay for the arrival of absent Cardinals, and allowed the Sacred College to select any location for the conclave, *within or without the city*, without being convinced that the dying Pontiff foresaw very clearly what a violent storm was impending. What no one foresaw, however, and what frustrated Pope Gregory's wise precautions, was the suddenness with which the storm broke out. He had fondly imagined he should survive until the autumn; before that time he should have removed his court either to Avignon or Anagni. Unfortunately, he was carried off by death on the evening of March 27th, leaving his cardinals without a programme, and without much cohesion in the midst of an organized and determined population. He was the last Frenchman who has sat in the chair of St. Peter.

Gregory's remains were not yet cold when it became patent that the magistrates, the clergy and populace of Rome had resolved upon and formulated a programme which they were bent upon carrying through at any price. The next Pope must be a Roman or, at least, an Italian. This resolution, thrown into the shape of a watchword, greeted the cardinals at every turn. It was uttered by the officers of the city with ever-increasing energy and ever-decreasing reverence; it was bellowed by the vulgar on the public squares, with significant allusions to their knives and axes; it was taken up finally by piping women and lisping infants. At first the Sacred College strove to present a bold front to this popular movement. Convening the bannerets and other city officials, the cardinals exhorted them to allay the excitement of their fellow-citizens.

It was the office of the Sacred College, they said, to select a proper Shepherd for the Church, and it should be left perfectly free and untrammelled. The cardinals could give no pledges as to nationality, for such pledges would be null and void, and the result might be disastrous. Let the Romans have patience, and they should find that the cardinals would discharge their duty in a satisfactory manner. This evasive answer only served to redouble the commotion of the Romans, and the excitement grew to a white heat, when it was reported that the French Camerlengo of the Pope, whose office it was to provide for the security of the conclave, had, in his mistrust of the Romans, dispatched secretly for the Cardinal of Geneva's Breton troops to reinforce the feeble garrison of the castle. It was only by great good fortune that the Camerlengo escaped the fury of the Romans, and found shelter behind the walls of St. Angelo, from which he never emerged until after the coronation of Urban. The next move of the bannerets was to secure all the gates and bridges of the city, nominally to guard



against the hostile Florentines, but in reality to prevent the departure of the cardinals. They also issued a proclamation commanding all the nobles to quit the city. The reason of this ordinance becomes clear when we remember that the Count of Fondi soon became the chief support of the seceding cardinals. The bondage of the Sacred College was complete when the bannerets introduced into the city several thousand mountaineers, armed to the teeth, who patrolled the streets, shouting out night and day : "*Romano lo volemo o Italiano.*"

A circumstance which brought the cardinals to the verge of despair was that, situated as they were, they were unable to unite their suffrages upon any one candidate. The sixteen cardinals who were to elect the new Pope were divided, as to extraction, into the following groups: Ten were Frenchmen, viz., the cardinals popularly known (for one reason or another) as *Limoges*, *Aigre-feuille*, *Marmoutiers*, *St. Angelo*, *St. Eustachius*, *Vernhio*, *Glandèves*, *Bretagne*, *Viviers* and *Poitiers*; four were Italians: *St. Peter*, *Florence*, *Milan* and *Orsini*; one was a Spaniard: *Pedro de Luna*; and, finally, one, Cardinal *Robert of Geneva*, might be considered, owing to the peculiar situation of his native town, as a German, a Frenchman or an Italian. The French were overwhelmingly in the majority, but there was an intestine discord which left them helpless. One-half of their number were from Pope Gregory's province of Limoges, and, as the Limousins had worn the tiara, and enjoyed a preponderating influence during the last four pontificates, it was the universal opinion, even among Frenchmen, that it was time to put an end to the Limousin dynasty. No other French cardinal seems to have had any following. It was natural, under the circumstances, that the cardinals should scan their Italian colleagues, but, unfortunately, there were fatal objections against each of these. The Cardinal of St. Peter was superannuated (if we believe Froissart, he was a hundred years old); the Cardinals of Milan and Florence were natives of cities then at war with the Holy See; Orsini was too young, and was, moreover, the scion of a Roman house prominently involved in all Roman disturbances and intrigues. There remained only the Cardinals of Geneva and Luna, upon the first of whom the unanimous vote of the Sacred College afterwards centred at Fondi. But Geneva was rendered ineligible by the fact that he was bitterly hated by the Romans on account of the excesses which had been committed by his Breton soldiery; and Luna (afterwards Benedict XIII.) was a young man who, as yet, possessed no influence. The cardinals, therefore, were all at sea, and, if left to themselves, might have voted and quarrelled for months before reaching a conclusion. They were not in condition to avail themselves of Pope Gregory's concessions, or, in-

deed, to take any resolute step, and they resigned themselves to drift with the tide.

When the nine days' obsequies of the deceased Pontiff were terminated, and the time arrived for entering the conclave, they drew back, and requested a respite of twenty-four hours, hoping vainly that the crowd of uncouth mountaineers would scatter to their homes. This exhibition of weakness only aggravated their situation. The mob became more aggressive and boisterous. When, at length, on the evening of Wednesday, April 7th, the terrified cardinals betook themselves to the Vatican to enter the conclave, it was with great difficulty they forced their way through the dense throng assembled on the piazza of St. Peter's, and each elector was greeted, at sight, with the old cry: "Death or an Italian"! There was no mistaking the earnestness of the populace, and not a cardinal who entered the sacred enclosure had any prospect of issuing alive unless he obeyed the mandate of the Romans. One cardinal, Glandèves, took the precaution, before leaving his residence, to draw up, before a notary and witnesses, his protest against the violence exercised upon him, and his declaration that he regarded the coming election as illegal and void.

Fearing that the popular demonstration which they had permitted, if not organized, might be insufficient to sway the minds of the cardinals, the bannerets forced their way into the sacred precinct of the conclave, and admonished the Sacred College that unless the people were satisfied, there was no knowing how the affair would terminate. The cardinals replied, with dignity, that they could give no premature pledges without vitiating the election; let the magistrates impress upon the people the conviction that their unruly conduct might have the very opposite result to that which the Romans desired; let the people disband and return to their homes.

The people were in no humor for disbanding. A large portion of them had no homes in Rome, and bivouacked on the square. Towards midnight the mob grew hungry and thirsty, and they made an onslaught on the Pontifical cellar. Torrents of good wine were poured down their throats; rivers of it, we are told, ran flowing to the Tiber. All night long, through the corridors of the Vatican, rang the cries of a drunken mob: "Death to the French!" "Give us an Italian Pope!" We can yield a ready credence to the affirmation of the poor cardinals that, when the little bell tinkled in the conclave the next morning, they arose from weary and sleepless beds.

They arose to set about performing the most awfully responsible duty which Almighty God has entrusted to the agency of man. Assembling in their little chapel, they assisted at a Mass of

the Holy Ghost, and a second Mass of the feria. Then the Cardinal of Florence, who, in his capacity of Bishop of Porto, was the prior of the Sacred College, began to address his colleagues. But scarcely had he begun to speak when his voice was drowned by the bells of St. Peter's and the great bell of the Capitol, ringing the ominous alarm, one stroke of which was still able to bring together "above twenty thousand men."<sup>1</sup> The drunken mob lying about and within the Vatican sprang to their feet; and they were soon reinforced by the populace pouring in from all quarters of the city. Whether drunk or sober, whether respectable citizens or vile outcasts, the cry of the Italians was still the same: "We must have a Roman or at least an Italian Pope!" Several prelates then present in the Vatican, have testified that the cry was accompanied with menaces of death.<sup>2</sup>

Up to this point there has been but slight difficulty in disentangling the truth from the enormous mass of perverted and exaggerated testimony so laboriously gathered together by Gayet. But just here, where the tragedy rushes on to its sudden catastrophe, we are involved in gross darkness. That the violence of the mob grew more and more aggressive, until finally the populace broke into the conclave and dispersed the Sacred College, is undeniable. That, at the end of the deplorable scene, the archbishop of Bari emerged as Pope Urban VI., is equally clear. All the intermediate stages of the affair will probably never be known. We shall be obliged to take one of two sets of contradictory statements, and become Urbanists or Clementists; or else, we must imitate those who, despairing of being able to learn the truth, remained neutral. It is easy for the historian, at this late date, to declare his neutrality; but all those from whose testimony we are to learn the facts of the case were, necessarily, partisans. The Urbanists maintain, that the cardinals were exposed to no danger of life or limb until *after* the election of Urban; that they had agreed upon him before entering the conclave; that their trepidation was owing to the fact that by electing him they had disobeyed the mandate of the people who were clamoring for a *Roman*, whereas, the cardinals had chosen a man who was, in reality, more nearly allied with

<sup>1</sup> Gibbon, chapter 70.

<sup>2</sup> For instance, the Bishop of Assisi heard the mob yelling: "Per Deum crucifixum in conclavi habemus istos ultramontanos, et nisi romanum faciant vel ytalicum omnes conderemus pro frusta."

Another witness heard the following cry: "Messere le Cardinali, Romano lo volemo o almanco Italiano, se no toti quanti serete cisi, per Bacco!"

Still another: "Despachate vos, per carno de Dyo, no vulhati mori."

These depositions are interesting specimens of mediæval grammar and orthography. Evidently the era of the renaissance had not yet begun. See further testimony, ap. Gayet, i, 271.



France than with Italy.<sup>1</sup> The Urbanists are not unanimous in explaining why the Romans broke into the conclave. Some of them attribute it to their anger against the foreign cardinals for having elected an Italian instead of a Roman; others to a misunderstanding between the name of *Bari* and that of an obnoxious French official, John de Bar; still others maintain that they forced their way in for the sake of congratulating the Cardinal of St. Peter whom they erroneously supposed to have been elected. Their main contention, however, is that the pressure from without had no influence upon the choice of Urban, who had been freely elected before any disturbance occurred. They further maintain, that Urban's election was freed from any possible taint by the subsequent conduct of the cardinals, who voluntarily returned the next day, assured the new Pope that his election had been canonical, enthroned him, crowned him, notified their colleagues at Avignon that everything had proceeded orderly, bade the nations obey him, and by word and deed acknowledged him for their lawful sovereign during the space of three months. Their secession, say the Urbanists, was due to their dislike of Pope Urban's efforts to reform them.

Every one of these statements has been vigorously repelled by the cardinals, and, on their oath, pronounced to be false. The Clementist version of the story may be summed up as follows: The cardinals had entered the conclave fully resolved to resist the pressure of the mob and to elect some member of their college. The Roman magistrates would not allow the conclave to be walled up as prescribed by custom; and it was only after much persuasion that the cardinals succeeded in having the door secured by a wooden beam. They had not yet begun the election when the alarm was rung by the bells of the Capitol and St. Peter's, followed closely by the deafening shouts and the dire menaces of the mob. The bannerets approached the two prelates who stood on guard at the door of the conclave, and begged them to inform the Sacred College of the determined attitude of the multitude, who, they said, were now beyond control. The two prelates conveyed the desired information to the Sacred College, with the admonition to lose no time in assuring the Romans that their demand would be granted. After a hasty deliberation the cardinals decided that further resistance was useless. They deputed three of their number to go to the door of the conclave and give the desired pledge. Taking advantage of the momentary calm thus procured they proceeded to discuss the possible candidates. The Italian cardinals

---

<sup>1</sup> Urban was of Neapolitan extraction, and was, therefore, the subject of Queen Joan, who was of French descent. Moreover, he had spent the better part of his life at the court of Avignon, and was favorably known to the cardinals by the ability with which he had filled the office of vice-chancellor of the Holy See.

declined to accept a nomination under the circumstances. Orsini refused to be coerced into voting at all. He suggested they should make an illusory election of some Franciscan monk, and, under cover of this strategem, flee the city with their fictitious appointee, put the poor monk in prison, and reassemble in some spot where they should be safe from coercion. To the older heads this proposition of the young Roman appeared too radical. They deemed it preferable to select a candidate to whom they could consistently adhere unto the end.

It was incumbent on the Cardinal of Florence, as dean of the Sacred College, to make a beginning. "Since the pledge which has been extorted from us by the Romans," said he, "limits our choice to an Italian, I nominate the Cardinal of St. Peter." Next followed the Cardinal of Limoges: "The Cardinal of St. Peter," he said, "is too old and infirm to bear the burden of the Pontificate. My Lords of Milan and Florence have declined the dignity. Orsini is young and inexperienced. I, therefore, give my vote in favor of Bartholomew Prignano, Archbishop of Bari, ut sit verus Papa." Aigrefeuille and the other Limousins followed in the footsteps of their chief. Bretagne strove to turn the flowing tide by suggesting some Italian Cardinal; but finally revised his vote, and agreed to the election of Bari. "I," said St. Angelo, "consent *taliter qualiter*; for I am acting under compulsion, and I hold that this election is invalid." "For my part," said Orsini, "I refuse to vote until the Romans mend their manners. However, I will not resist the decision of the majority." It was ultimately agreed that Bari should receive the unanimous vote of the Sacred College: they should notify him, proclaim him, and then make their escape to some safe place where they could re-elect him canonically.

This succinct narrative of the proceedings in conclave, which it has taken you, good reader, only two minutes to peruse, has been extracted by us out of an enormous mass of depositions. We are not certain, even now, that we have stated things as they really happened.

We have judged, however, that the most trustworthy account of the proceedings of the cardinals in conclave is that contained in the *Casus* drawn up in Tivoli by the Italian cardinals in July, 1378, when they were deliberating as to the course which they were in conscience obliged to pursue. They had not yet abandoned Pope Urban; but it was apparent that the more they reflected on the scenes they had witnessed the deeper grew their sense of the indignities inflicted upon the Sacred College. Let us return to the conclave.

The Archbishop of Bari was elected before noon of Thursday, April 8th. Nothing further remained for the cardinals to do than

to proclaim the result to the people. Yet they shrank from making the announcement. What had they any longer to fear? say the Urbanists. If they had chosen Bari, as they afterwards professed, solely under the influence of terror inspired by an armed mob, why did they not hasten to placate that mob by proclaiming the nominee? This embarrassing question was put to the cardinals a score of times by their adversaries; and our opinion as to the legality of Urban's election will be mainly determined by the amount of credit which we shall bestow on their answers. Those answers may be summed up as follows: They aver that when they acquiesced in the election of Bari they honestly supposed they had hit upon a happy expedient which would at the same time conciliate the threatening rioters and enable themselves to retire with some relic of dignity. The populace had clamored for a Roman or Italian. To have chosen a Roman partisan, such as the Abbot of Monte Cassino, would have been an ignominious surrender of their freedom. They fancied they manifested a great deal of spirit by yielding only half way and selecting a prelate whose reputation for probity gave them every reason to expect that he would not found any pretensions to the papacy on proceedings so clearly invalid. But to the dismay of the cardinals they discovered that the insolence of the mob was growing apace. A deputation of bannerets summoned them once more to the door of the conclave, and, after reproaching them with their tardiness, made known to them that the Roman people would not be satisfied with a mere Italian; they had concluded, upon reflection, that only the election of a Roman would secure the permanent re-establishment of the papal court in their city.<sup>1</sup>

The cardinals, after rebuking the turbulence of the populace bade the magistrates disperse the multitude. "We promise you," they added, "that by to-morrow morning you shall have a Roman or Italian Pope." Meantime they slipped a note into the hand of the guardian of the conclave, in which they requested the immediate presence of the Archbishop of Bari and of several other Italian prelates. Bari, suspecting the true motive of his summons, took the precaution, before proceeding to the Vatican, to secure his personal effects; for it was one of the refined customs of the mediæval Romans to loot the house of each Pope-elect. When he arrived in the palace, he was, we are told, extremely shocked by the sights which met his gaze. The Vatican, surrounded and

<sup>1</sup> It is admitted by both parties that the Romans modified their watchword so as to exclude any but a Roman. The Urbanists maintain this was done *before* the election of Prignano; their adversaries are just as positive that it was only *subsequently* to that event. We can more readily understand of what vital importance this contention is to either side than we can decide which party is telling the truth.



invaded by drunken rioters, resembled the disorderly camp of Goths or Vandals rather than the peaceful home of the Vicar of Christ. "He himself," says the Cardinal of Florence, "confessed to us with his own mouth in Tivoli, and in the presence of witnesses, that an election thus held could possess no legal value."

Meanwhile the cardinals, having taken their dinner, re-assembled in the little chapel of the conclave to discuss whether they should announce the result immediately, or wait until the following day. One of them suggested that they should re-elect Bari *ad cautelam*. This proposition was rejected by others on the ground that the pressure upon the Sacred College still continued. Their deliberations were soon broken off by the impatience of the people, who, having somehow learned that the elect was not to be a Roman, began to pound upon the door of the conclave, shrieking: *Romano lo volemo!* Whilst the cardinals were looking about for some means of egress the door fell with a crash; and in rushed an excited multitude, brandishing their swords and shouting, *Romano! Romano!* The cardinals fled for shelter into cells and closets; but were soon brought back unceremoniously into the chapel. There is no telling how the affair would have ended had not some one (it is uncertain whether a cardinal or an attendant) cried out: "A Roman *has* been chosen, the Cardinal of St. Peter; but he will not accept." A shout of triumph rang through the palace. Forgetting the other members of the Sacred College, the Romans rushed upon the poor, gouty old man; threw the pontifical mantle about him; placed the mitre on his head; carried him bodily to the altar of the chapel; and, in spite of his protestations that "he was not the Pope, the Archbishop of Bari was Pope," they persisted in paying him homage.

The other Cardinals, taking advantage of this unforeseen diversion of their tormentors, "stood not upon the order of their going," but, some without hat or cape, some donning the first hood which came to hand, effected their escape. Had they taken the precaution, before dispersing, to fix upon a rendezvous in some safe place, where they could proceed instantly to a new election, we presume they would have retained the sympathy and allegiance of the Christian world. But just then, the thought uppermost in their minds was to provide for their personal safety. "If I am to be canonized," said one of them, "I prefer the category of the Confessors to that of the Martyrs." Four succeeded in escaping from the city. Geneva fled to Zagorolo; Orsini and St. Eustachius to the Orsini stronghold of Vicovaro; St. Angelo retired to Ardea. Six others, viz., Limoges, Aigrefeuille, Poitiers, Viviers, Bretagne, and Vernhio, disguised as pilgrims, clerics, or laymen, gained admittance into Castle St. Angelo. The Cardinal of St. Peter remained in the

Vatican. The others locked themselves within their dwellings. Such was the posture of affairs when the darkness fell upon what the Cardinal of Geneva quaintly termed "la plus orde journée qui fut faite, passés sont deux cents ans." It was, indeed, a dismal day; and the passions then aroused were not allayed until the youngest actors in the lamentable tragedy had passed from this earth to stand before the judgment seat of Christ!

The Archbishop of Bari spent the night of Thursday, April 8th, in the pontifical apartment of the Vatican. He rose the next morning, a Pope unproclaimed, unenthroned, with no one authorized to proclaim or enthrone him. What you or we should have done in his position, or what he, himself, would have done had he possessed the experience which he subsequently acquired at a great cost,—these are very irrelevant questions. Whatever may have been his defects, lack of intrepidity was never attributed to him. The evening before, when the mob were bent on installing the Cardinal of St. Peter, and greeted the name of Bari with "Death to him!" he was urged by his friends to resign (an Urbanist bishop tells the story): "Resign!" he had answered, "No! not though a thousand swords were pointed at my throat."

A circumstance which had considerably ameliorated his situation was, that the Bannerets of Rome, having been apprised by the Cardinal of St. Peter that Bari had been elected, had, in a solemn assembly in the Capitol, deigned to acknowledge him, and had forced the mob to do likewise. At an early hour on Friday morning, the officials of the city came to the Vatican to present their compliments to the new Vicar of Christ. Bari declined their homage as premature. Until he had been placed upon the throne by the cardinal-electors, "absolutely nothing had been accomplished." According to the cardinals, this was a broad hint thrown out to the bannerets that they should compel the members of the Sacred College to make their appearance. Certain it is, that the bannerets were very active and persistent in their efforts to induce the cardinals to repair to the Vatican. First, they visited the five cardinals who had, on the previous evening, returned to their dwellings, viz., Florence, Milan, Marmoutier, Glandève, and Luna. These were brought, one by one, with more or less persuasion, if not coercion. It is highly improbable that five individuals, isolated in a hostile city, and ignorant alike of the fate and of the intentions of their colleagues, should have offered any great show of resistance. We should be more pleased to learn how they conducted themselves when they were united in the presence of Bari; and how they advised him, as being his official counselors. But, unfortunately, these are things we shall never be able to make out with certainty; not through the defect, but through

the abundance of depositions, directly contradictory and irreconcilable.

In the chief Urbanist document, relating the incidents of the election, it is stated that these five cardinals came to the palace of their own accord; congratulated the archbishop very warmly on his elevation to the papacy; assured him that he had been freely and canonically elected; and begged him to invite the remaining cardinals to take part in the ceremony of enthroning him. "The Pope-elect in order to enlighten his conscience, and to ascertain clearly and firmly how the matter stood, interrogated the five cardinals, both singly and collectively, whether he had, in very deed, been sincerely, purely, freely, and canonically elected; for, said he, unless my election has been free and canonical, I will not accept. The aforesaid Cardinals, each and several, answered that never had Roman Pontiff been so freely and canonically elected; they begged him, for God's sake, not to refuse or delay his consent; some of them furthermore admonished him that he could not decline without committing a grievous sin, for it would be exceedingly difficult for the Sacred College to reassemble, or to agree upon another candidate.<sup>1</sup>

This statement is clear and positive. But equally clear and positive is Florence's denial of every assertion contained in it. When the Spanish ambassadors in their cross-examination of this cardinal questioned him as to this passage of Urban's *factum*, he replied as follows:

"I answer that on the aforesaid morning I went to the palace *on the requisition of the city officials*, as I have already stated; and that the other Cardinals came one at a time in obedience, I believe, to similar requisitions. As to the remaining affirmations contained in the interrogatory, they are, so far as they concern me, unquestionably false and devoid of truth; as concerns my colleagues, they are likewise false, so far as I could see and hear. I am certain that I never said one word of all that is therein attributed to me; and I observed that each cardinal, as he arrived, held very few words with the archbishop. I did, however, hear the latter urge the Romans to go, or send for the cardinals who were still in the castle; his words were, 'Unless they come nothing is accomplished.' I say and affirm that we held no meeting on that occasion; neither did he make mention to us, nor we to him, of any of the alleged topics."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Raynaldi, an. 1378, c. 90.

<sup>2</sup> In order to blunt the edge of Florence's testimony, the new editor of Hefelé, Dr. Knöpfler (who, being a German, is naturally an Urbanist), maintains: 1st. That the main assertions of Urban's *Factum* are expressly conceded by the *Casus* of the Italian cardinals. 2d. That Florence himself, in a letter to a friend written on April 14th



It was now after mid-day, and only six cardinals had presented themselves in the Vatican. The key of the situation was in the hands of the six cardinals who were behind the thick walls of St. Angelo. The whole morning had been wasted in apparently fruitless parleys between them and the messengers of Bari. About noon, however, the cardinals in the castle had so far yielded as to transmit to their colleagues in the Vatican a written document authorizing the latter to proclaim and enthrone the archbishop. This exhibition of weakness emboldened the archbishop to make a final assault upon their obstinacy. He made use, for this purpose, of the senator and bannerets of the city. What were they to say? According to the Urbanists, they were to apologize to the cardinals for the violence of the populace on the preceding evening, and to assure them that, as the Roman people were now satisfied with the Pope-elect, the Sacred College had no further reason to fear. According to the Clementists, they were to intimidate the six by representing to them that the walls of the castle were a weak protection against the fury of an entire nation, and by reminding them that, even if their own persons were secure, their families and their property were at the mercy of the Romans.

Take your choice of contradictory statements, as usual, beloved readers. Having set both sides before you, we leave you perfectly free. Whatever considerations influenced their movements, the six rode out of the castle about vesper-time; and, simultaneously with their cavalcade, out rides the last remnant of sympathy with them from our soul. They had declined the crown of martyrdom; we certainly shall not regard them as Confessors, or *men*. Their scarlet robes may remind *them* of their insulted dignity; they do not convey to *us* any suggestion of Roman or Christian fortitude.

The rest of the story is easily told. Twelve of the sixteen electors re-assembled in the little chapel of the conclave. They summoned the Archbishop of Bari, and announced to him that he was the choice of the Sacred College. He accepted. They asked him the name by which he should be known. He answered, *Urban*. Whilst the other cardinals paid him homage and chanted the *Te Deum*, Cardinal Vernhio from a window of the palace made the customary proclamation to the multitude: "I announce to you tidings of great joy. We have a Supreme Pontiff, Urban VI."

The four fugitives, when they learned that Urban was seated on the throne of St. Peter, returned to the city and took part in the solemn ceremony of his coronation, and in the procession to the

---

(only five days later) acknowledged the validity of Urban's election, and lauded the new Pope to the skies. But the learned doctor is hardly ingenuous. For 1st. The Italian Cardinals do not *admit* the fact; they give it as *ipse dicit* and *dicit quod*. 2d. Florence denied on oath that he ever wrote the letter in question.

Lateran. Letters were dispatched by Urban to all the Christian states announcing his election, and by the cardinals to their brethren in Avignon, purporting, "that in choosing the Archbishop of Bari they had beyond doubt acted under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost." It is admitted, alike by his friends and his enemies, that had Urban possessed, or retained, a moderate amount of prudence or common sense, he could easily have staunched the recent wounds inflicted upon the dignity of the Sacred College. But, unfortunately, he was an example (neither the first nor the last) of an efficient subaltern transformed by force of circumstances into an incompetent leader. A church historian has aptly applied to him the epigram in which Tacitus sums up his estimate of Galba, *omnium consensu capax imperii nisi imperasset*.<sup>1</sup>

Not twenty-four hours had elapsed after he was crowned with the tiara (it was the very day on which the cardinals wrote their conciliatory letter to Avignon) before Urban gravely offended his court by proclaiming, in public consistory, that every bishop then residing in Rome was a perjurer, and false to his diocese. This mock-heroic utterance was the more absurd because, in all probability, the "reformer" had never entered the gates of his own Bari. The general sentiment of his audience was voiced by the Spanish bishop of Pampeluna, whom Gregory had retained with him as his canonist. "I will not endure," he cried out, "to be called a perjurer. I am here not for my pleasure, but in the interest of Holy Church." Now, surely it was a bad state of affairs, and cried for reform (and, indeed, has since been reformed), that the Pope's canonist and his vice-chancellor should draw their support from dioceses which they personally neglected. But it was the height of folly to impute to individuals the fault of a system. Had Pampeluna, Bari, and the rest, gone to reside in their respective cities, who would have been left to attend to the work of the Holy See? If, on the other hand, they resigned their episcopal livings, what revenue was a mediæval Pope possessed of with which to support them?

Theodoric of Niem (Urban's adherent and secretary) from whom we have learned the foregoing incident, gives us many similar specimens of this Pope's crude efforts at reform. Another well-known (no doubt necessary, but very obnoxious) institution of the papacy in those ages, was that of the Collectors of Dues to the Apostolic Chamber. One of these collectors returned to Rome in the early days of Pope Urban with a sum of money which he had gathered. Imagine the poor man's surprise, when the Pope greeted him with the salutation: "Thy money go with thee into perdition!" It is hardly necessary to add, that before long Urban

<sup>1</sup> Baron Henrion, l. 46.

collected his dues with as much exactness as any of his predecessors. We refrain from going through the whole list of his eccentricities, as they are rehearsed with sorrow by his friends; how he commanded his cardinals to content themselves with a single dish at each meal; how he openly reviled them as simonists in taking fees from princes; how he bade one of them hold his tongue; threatened to strike another; called a third a chatterbox, and a fourth a fool.<sup>1</sup>

The explosion came when, in public consistory, he accused the Cardinal of Amiens (who had recently returned from an embassy to Tuscany) of being a prevaricator, a taker of bribes, and a traitor. The affronted cardinal immediately sprang to his feet: "*Baren-sis, mentiris!*" he exclaimed. This vigorous retort produced the effect of an electric shock; it precipitated the suspended elements of bitterness. It was far more than the expression of his personal feelings. It was the formal opening of the Great Schism of the West. This Benedictine monk, John de la Grange, Cardinal of Amiens, was recognized, by friend and foe, as the master-spirit of the storm.<sup>2</sup>

The subsequent stages of the melancholy history—how the Transalpine cardinals seceded to Anagni, and called to their defence the Breton troops, and issued their manifesto to the Christian world; how Urban sought, when it was too late, to coax them back, and how the three Italian cardinals (the Cardinal of St. Peter died in September) wavered for months between both parties; how the cardinals summoned Urban to lay down his "usurped" dignity, and on his refusal declared him a sacrilegious intruder, and proceeded to the election of Clement VII.; how Christendom, having vainly endeavored to avert the impending tempest, was divided between the two Obediences—all this is too deeply engraven on the minds of our readers to need recounting.

But why have we gone rummaging among the documents drawn by scholars "out of the secret archives of the Vatican," to dish up old scandals that were well forgotten? One reason (written on the very face of our article) has been that we might correct the biassed statements of our ordinary text-books, the authors of which have copied each other's account of the quarrel, and the main fountain of whose information on the subject is the very partial narrative of Raynaldi. This distinguished author compiled his

<sup>1</sup> To any one who is familiar with the course of Urban's administration, and who remembers how violently he strove to win a kingdom for his worthless nephew, Francis, and how he condoned the scandalous behavior of this young scapegrace, it sounds ludicrous to hear Urban VI. pronounced a reformer.

<sup>2</sup> Si Cardinalis Ambianensis non fuisset, nil fuisset de istis novitatibus, sighs the chief advocate of Urban. Ap. Raynaldi, an. 1378, n. 45.



narrative from a careful study of the original documents preserved in the Vatican; and we cannot impeach his honesty for having given credence to Italian in preference to Transalpine witnesses. A partisan writer will invariably do likewise. A commission, made up of Democrats and Republicans, will always return a seven-by-eight verdict. A Tory will believe a policeman's testimony any day rather than a Home Ruler's. The learned world owes a debt of gratitude to the able chaplain of St. Louis's Church, in Rome, for publishing these documents; and though we regret that he has felt called upon to become a partisan on the other side (probably for the sake of forcing a hearing), he has almost converted us to the belief that a cloud rests on the title of Urban VI.; and we are half-inclined to echo the sentiment of the old German writer, whom he quotes: *ab isto Urbano VI. usque ad Martinum V. nescio quis fuit Papa*. We trust that writers will discontinue to speak of Clement VII. and Benedict XIII. as *anti-Popes*, or apply to the Church which produced St. Vincent Ferrer the epithet of *schismatical*.

But our chief concern is to convince our readers with how great wisdom Holy Church is extremely careful to guard the complete freedom of the papal elections. It is no great harm to be optimistic and to believe that the recurrence of the great calamity which threatened the very existence of the Church in the fourteenth century is now improbable. But we must remember that thunderstorms very frequently break over our heads with but scant forewarnings. What American citizen imagined that the year 1876, which opened so auspiciously and progressed so brilliantly, would close amidst doubt and terrors? At a time when the Vicar of Christ is proclaiming to the world that his position in Rome is becoming daily more and more unbearable, it is well to let it be known that the Catholic world is in no temper to condone any insults offered to the Sacred College by howling mobs or intruding bannerets.

---

EDITORIAL NOTE: Though the "Great Schism of the West" is healed, the historical schism of contending national writers about it will probably be never healed. As there can be no historical ecumenical council, it is only fair to leave both sides to the private judgment of our readers. The following is, however, the judgment of one who was one of the greatest church historians of our day, the lately deceased Cardinal Hergenröther: "But all these tumults were not of the kind to interfere with the freedom of election; in fact, in the afternoon twelve cardinals held a second election altogether free, when the choice again fell on the Archbishop of Bari. Order was soon restored; the election was

solemnly proclaimed on April 9th, and on the 10th the enthronization took place in the Church of St. Peter, while on Easter Sunday (18th of April) the coronation was solemnized.

"The new Pope, Urban VI., received general recognition. All the cardinals there assembled attended at his coronation, assisted him at the ecclesiastical feasts, requested spiritual favors at his hands and wrote an account of what had passed to their colleagues in Avignon, with the assurance that perfect freedom and unanimity had prevailed. The six cardinals who had been left in Avignon also acknowledged him as Pope and ordered the commandant of the Castle of St. Angelo to deliver up the keys to him, as the former Pope had made this surrendering of the keys of that fortress dependent on their consent. Moreover, Urban's escutcheon was exposed at Avignon and homage done to it." (Church History, Vol. II., p. 35.)

---

## THE LATIN VULGATE CIVILIZING WESTERN EUROPE.

IT is impossible to study, without admiration, the ways of Providence in employing the Latin Vulgate, not only in the regeneration but in the civilization of Western Europe. These results blend together, indeed, so that to a great extent many, looking only at the religious side, lose sight entirely of the secular consequences. Yet, the more the subject is investigated, the deeper becomes the conviction in the mind as to the immense service rendered by the Latin Vulgate in introducing civilization, learning, science, and the arts, among the ruder tribes of the north and east, and the nations in central-east and southeast Europe, which had already made some advances, and, in time, extending the salutary influence throughout the world.

The Greek Church never showed great missionary spirit, or sent its priests to the nations on the north and northeast in order to win them to Christ. Its strength was wasted and its faith weakened by subtle heresies, and the struggle to repress them. The Church was too much absorbed by internal trials to carry out the great command to teach the nations. It nationalized even what it did. If Ulfilas went forth to convert his fellow Goths, he did not carry the Greek language. Both he and St. John Chrysostom had the Liturgy rendered into Gothic, and Ulfilas translated the Scrip-

tures into Gothic, to become soon obsolete, and to exercise little influence in civilizing the Gothic nation. The Gothic churches in Constantinople soon disappeared, and the race gained nothing of the civilization, culture, arts, and literature of Hellas. Only a few acquiring the language were enabled to appreciate all this, and carry their studies further. So, too, when the Greek Church sent St. Cyril and St. Methodius to the Slavonians, she failed to open the way for her culture and civilization. The clergy of the Slavs, with missal and breviary in their own tongue, looked no further, and were isolated from all the literary, scientific, and art progress of the rest of the world, and this became a field on which only one in ten thousand could enter by foreign travel and the acquisition of foreign idioms. Under this system each nation soon became isolated and stood alone, out of the current of contemporary thought and of the accumulated experience of more cultured nations.

The Greek language was the vehicle through which Christianity reached Rome, and ports of France and Spain, like Marseilles and Tarragona. For a time, even there, the Greek language was identified with the Church. The New Testament was read in Greek; the Old Testament in the version of the Septuagint. The language was in such general use that the earliest Popes all wrote in Greek. The Bible was translated into Latin, not for use in Italy, but in Spain and northern Africa. In the latter part of the Roman Empire, according to the judgment of scholars, the *Vetus Itala*, or early Latin translation, was formed. Other translations may have been made in Gaul and Spain. As the use of Greek died out in Italy, these Latin versions became the general books of the faithful; sacramentaries or missals, psalters and breviaries, in Latin, based on the *Vetus Itala*, gradually grew into use. There were variances in these translations, still greater variances in the manuscript copies, even where one type was followed. It was to put an end to this state of things, and introduce uniformity, that Pope Damasus induced St. Jerome to prepare a correct and faithful edition of the Latin Bible to serve as a standard. St. Jerome, in Palestine, aided by learned Hebrew scholars, revised the Old Testament translation by the Hebrew, and the New Testament he revised by the Greek. The book of the Psalms presented difficulties, because such differences appeared between the Latin translation in use among the clergy and the Hebrew as St. Jerome translated it, that Pope Damasus retained the old translation, substantially, while adopting the rest of St. Jerome's work for general use in the Church. The Bible thus revised by St. Jerome became the Vulgate, the general and recognized Latin translation of the Holy Scriptures. Liturgy and Canonical Hours conformed to it. Wherever



the Latin language continued to be spoken in Italy, in the Roman districts of northern Africa, in Spain, Gaul, in Britain, where the imperial rule had made Latin the language of the laws and the courts, the army, and official life, Latin became the voice of the spiritual empire which was to stand unshaken, and full of life, when the political fabric built up by the Cæsars crumbled away, and the once proud mistress of the world could exercise no power beyond the Alps, and was scarcely recognized beneath the shadow of the Apennines. Even where new tongues came in to supersede the Latin, the Church held her own. She taught the doctrines of Christ to the Saxon conquerors of Britain; to the Franks who subdued Gaul; the Goths who built up kingdoms in the Celtiberian peninsula; to the Lombards who seated themselves at the foot of the Alps. Heiress alone, of the past learning and civilization of Rome, she retained not only the language in her liturgy, but, training the children of the conquering tribes to its use, employed it in elevating and civilizing them, by making it the vehicle of instructing nations, destitute of a literature or written speech, in the noblest works of the poet, orator, historian, and philosopher, who were the boast of Rome. By this means she elevated their minds and taste, enabled them to appreciate and admire the work of sculptor, painter, and architect, until from these men of bold hearts and grand thoughts, nurtured amid the wildest scenes of nature, grew up new ideas of architecture and art, full of symmetry and grace, not framed by straight lines, cramped and confined, but like the works of nature, infinite in curves of beauty, aspiring as the trees of the forest, rich in variety as the flowers of the field. But the Church not only held her own against the influx of the barbarians whom she won, but, still vigorous and full of energy, she bore the cross where the eagle of Rome had never been seen or penetrated only to sustain disaster and defeat. Her missionary priests bore her Latin liturgy and her Vulgate to convert and civilize the brave Helvetii; the German bands from the Rhine to the Vistula; the tribes of the Low Countries amid their marshes; the Scandinavians, amid the mountains, cataracts and forests; to the rugged hills of Caledonia; the rich island of Erin, even to the Orkneys, Iceland, and Greenland. The word of God went to all these in Latin, and that tongue was thus in daily use among them all. Latin became the language of monastery and school; Latin, the medium by which other ancient languages, Greek and Hebrew, were acquired, and the treasures of learning laid open. To the Vulgate, and the widespread influence it gave the Latin language, western Europe owes its earlier history, the preservation of its folklore and poetry. If Latin suffered in purity, it acquired flexibility; the new conquests gave original forms to poetry, and Christian

hymnology became a new literature replete with grandeur, grace, and beauty, though it caught the echoing rhyme of the Celts, and its metre is not that of Virgil, Horace, or Ovid.

This general diffusion of Latin led to the formation of the present Italian, French, Spanish and Portuguese languages, Latin in the main with words adapted locally from the conquering races; it imbued the languages of Britain, Germany and Scandinavia with a vocabulary of new words and terms, and while these languages were gradually acquiring a permanent form and character, leading the way to modern literature, the Latin liturgy and the Latin Vulgate, which had Christianized and civilized all western Europe, made the official language of the Church the universal means of communication of learning, of intercourse among scholars, of intellectual and scientific progress. Through this language the learning of Greece entered into the studies of the west, the labors of her geographers were studied by Irish and Norseman monk; the acute reasoning of her philosophers trained scholars in the Black Forest, in Gothland, at Yarrow and Clonmacnoise; mathematics and astronomy were studied as keenly on the British isles as in the schools of Greece. Thus scholars in different little kingdoms and states, with a common language in church and school, held intercourse with each other, and all profited by any progress made. Science revealed new secrets in nature, and the value of combinations hitherto unknown. Amid all this onward movement the Vulgate stood respected and honored as the source of the civilization and culture which prevailed.

When the portals of the east and west were thrown open, the messengers of the Cross went forth bearing the Vulgate; from its pages the story of man's creation, fall and redemption were taught to the people of India and Ceylon, Farther India, Japan and China and the Philippines. The parts selected from the Gospels and other parts of the Bible were translated from the Vulgate into the languages of the far east and the islands of the Pacific.

The missionaries who followed the path of the Christ bearer of Genoa, brought the Vulgate with him to the New World. As they acquired Indian languages, parts of the Bible, especially the Epistles and Gospels for Sundays were translated by them from the venerable text of St. Jerome. The Epistles and Gospels in Mexican, printed in Italy, form a noble volume to stand beside the Clementine Bible. These Epistles and Gospels exist in the Montagnais and Huron of Canada, in our Chippewa, Cayuga, Mohawk, Illinois, in dialects of New Mexico and Texas, in Otomi, Maya, Inca, Aymara, Chilian, Tupi and Carib.

Thus the Vulgate made the circuit of the globe in its civilizing mission.

Yet this is but looking on the Vulgate from the human side in its effects on the material progress of mankind. In the supernatural life it was no less potent. The Vulgate was used by the Sovereign Pontiffs, by provincial and general councils, by universities and monastic schools. Its authority as a correct translation of the inspired writings was unassailed. In the cloister it was meditated, studied, annotated and illustrated. The pilgrims who, from the days of Adamnan visited the Holy Land, helped to elucidate and explain many points requiring local knowledge. By the Vulgate were formed the saints of all Western Europe, St. Patrick, St. Bede, St. Germanus, St. Isidore, St. Bernard, St. Bonaventure, St. Thomas of Aquin. It was borne to the nations by St. Patrick and St. Augustine, St. Kilian and St. Rumold, St. Boniface and St. Feargall, St. Columbanus and St. Gall. Its devout meditation inspired St. Bridget, St. Gertrude, St. Mechthildis, Thomas à Kempis, the founders of religious orders and of convents.

It could not have been in the order of Providence undesigned, that the Vulgate should be thus instrumental in diffusing a knowledge of the truths of Christianity, or in moulding so many generations to its spirit, till we reach the Ages of Faith. God never gave such results to a diffusion of error, however well intended the act of spreading it. Nor can any one look on the wonderful Guttenberg Bible, the first book issued from the press by the inventor of printing, admirable and enduring in its paper, enduring in its ink, perfect in its typography, and not feel that something more than accident, something higher than human thought induced the sanctifying of the new art by the production of the Latin Vulgate which had done so much for Europe. If we are to regard it as merely human, it was a proof of the veneration and respect universally entertained for that Latin translation of the Holy Scriptures, a proof of the general desire to obtain copies, a tribute to the pious love for the Vulgate which had been instilled into generation after generation.

"Up to the time of the discovery of America in 1492," says the bibliographer, Henry Stevens, "the editions of the Bible alone, and the parts thereof in many languages and countries, will sum up not far less than one thousand, and the most of these of the largest and costliest kind."

The greater part of these editions were of the Latin Vulgate, and of translations from it, so that in less than fifty years, fully half a million copies of the Bible had been scattered over Europe from the newly established Catholic presses.

A book multiplied so often and in different countries, at a time when there was no critical standard to guide, was represented by



numberless manuscripts of varying value, some carefully and respectfully prepared from a critical manuscript, some hurriedly made from any manuscript that came to hand. Alcuin had in vain endeavored to give a careful text; his work, and that of his school, were soon forgotten. The invention of printing did much to prevent the increase of errors; all the copies were exactly alike, and a very defective edition could be condemned and suppressed. The presses that started up in different countries gave editions of the Vulgate. The Hebrew, the Septuagint and the New Testament in Greek showed the tendency towards more thorough and critical studies; the numerous translations into German and other modern languages showed how the Church had created a love for the Word of God. Western Europe, with her Christianity based on the Vulgate, still looked to it with reverence when Luther raised the standard of revolt.

Luther began by assailing practices in the Church; his fierce vituperation gained the mob, and he next assailed points of doctrine. Lastly, he inveighed against the constitution of the Church, and denied all power to define articles of faith or establish discipline in the Church. Yet, as it was necessary that there should be authority somewhere, he placed it in the Scriptures, as interpreted by himself, decrying the authority of any part which clearly controverted his theories. As the Vulgate was the translation of the Bible uniformly used in Western Europe, he made his attack on this, denied its validity, and fell back on the Hebrew and the Greek. He announced his intention to give a new German Bible, and began with the New Testament, professing to translate from the Greek. He was not, however, a thorough Greek scholar even for his own day; not at all to be compared to Erasmus or Melancthon. He really used the Vulgate which he decried, and the twelve Catholic German translations, of which many editions had been printed before his birth and before his fall. After issuing the New Testament in parts, beginning with 1521, he set to work on the Old Testament. Slight as was his knowledge of Greek, his knowledge of Hebrew was far less, consisting of the elementary knowledge he had picked up during his stay at Wartburg. He was utterly unfitted for the serious work of rendering the Old Testament Hebrew into German, even had his violent and constant controversies given him the time such a task required. He relied on the Vulgate, on the German translations from it, on the Septuagint, and such Hebrew aids as he could obtain. The influence of existing Catholic German translations on his work has been traced and proved undeniably. But he was master of a vigorous style; his German translation, in which he cared far more for effect than for accuracy, became immensely popular.

Presented, though without foundation, as a careful, studious translation from the Hebrew and Greek, Luther's Bible was at once used to decry the Vulgate. Disregarding the fact that all the existing Christianity and sacred learning were linked inseparably with the Vulgate, it became the fashion to decry it as a faulty translation, far inferior to one made directly from the Hebrew and Greek. Yet there had been no extended collation of Greek and Hebrew manuscripts, no comparison of Hebrew manuscripts before the revision which the Jewish school at Masora made as an antidote against Christianity and those which followed that school. Any Hebrew or Greek manuscript that came to hand sufficed, and it is known that the first Greek Testament was printed from a manuscript so defective that it lacked part of the Apocalypse, which the editor supplied by translating the missing portion from the Latin Vulgate into Greek.

The same system of delusion was kept up in England where Tyndale's Testament was worked out by means of the Vulgate and Luther's translation, and where the first edition of Coverdale honestly admitted that it was "translated out of Douche and Latyn into English."

The ancient Latin translation of the Bible, revised by St. Jerome, which, in the hands of apostles and saints, had converted and sanctified Europe, was thus arraigned before the Christian world as unworthy of honor or credit. The words which had echoed through cathedral and abbey church, through cloister and cell, through university and school, were now treated by many, with derision and contempt. The whole fabric of Christendom was thus shaken, and every land, every newly-coined creed, had its own Bible, interpreted and translated to suit its own ideas.

This system has continued to our day, when we see a Bible issued in which the word "*baptize*" disappears, a revised Bible in which hell gives way to the name of a heathen deity, Hades.

Such was the condition of the Christian world when bishops gathered from all lands under the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff in the Council of Trent. There it became necessary to define the position held in the Western Church by the Vulgate. After fixing the canon of Holy Scripture in the fourth session, the decree proceeds: "Moreover, the same Sacred and Holy Synod, considering that no small utility may accrue to the Church of God, if it be made known, which out of all the Latin editions now in circulation of the sacred books, is to be held as authentic, ordains and declares that the said old and Vulgate edition, which, by the lengthened use of so many ages, has been approved of in the Church, be, in public lectures, disputations, sermons and expositions, held as authentic, and that no one is to dare or presume to

reject it under any pretext whatever." The Council proceeded to check the unauthorized and irresponsible editions of the Vulgate, and directed that it should be printed in the most correct manner possible.

The words of the Holy Synod are guarded. The original Hebrew and Greek are not slighted, passed upon or rejected. No such idea entered the minds of the Fathers of the Council of Trent. But the Vulgate had been too important an element in the work of bringing the barbarians from the deep night of heathendom into the glorious light of the Gospel; too important an element in raising them from savage life to Christian culture to permit the contempt thrown upon it by the demagogues of the Reformation to remain unanswered. The Council declared the Vulgate authentic. What is the force of the Word? A recent writer (Father Prat, S. J.) says: "In ordinary language this term authentic has two principal meanings. I say that a book, a will, a work of art, a glorious feat is authentic when it really belongs to the person who passes as its author. In this sense it may be said that the Vulgate is an authentic work of St. Jerome to signify that it is not falsely ascribed to him. But it is evident that the Council did not propose to determine St. Jerome's part in the Vulgate.

Authentic is also frequently used in jurisprudence to designate a document, either copied or translated, which is declared by the testimony of public officials to agree with the original. Such a document has the same weight as the original, and can be rejected or impeached only by questioning the truth of the attestation. In this case authentic is a synonym for official and legal.

Besides this meaning is another derived from it by an easily followed reasoning. In the Middle Ages, "authentic" meant simply worthy of faith. An authentic translation is a faithful translation; an authentic copy is a copy that reproduces the original without considering the authority which declares it such. This conformity with the text or original, as may easily be conceived, has infinite degrees.

"Now what is exactly the scope of the word authentic in the mind and on the lips of the Tridentine Fathers." "In the mind of the Fathers the word authentic awakens the two ideas (official and worthy of faith) so akin to each other, and each prevails according to the context and the circumstances." "We readily concede that the principal aim of the Council was not to define the fidelity of the Vulgate, in the first place because the decree in its nature is disciplinary and not dogmatic, and especially because a thing so clear and certain needed no definition. The public and constant use of the Latin churches for nine centuries was more than a sufficient definition. What, then, did the Council do? Accept-



ing and supposing the fidelity of the Vulgate as a notorious and attested fact, it confirms and canonizes it by inserting it in a conciliar decree; and it moreover gives this version, already authorized by the general use of the Church, the official character which it did not possess."

The next step was to pray the Sovereign Pontiff to issue a carefully-edited copy of the Vulgate to serve as a standard. This was undertaken by Pope Sixtus with the aid of many able scholars, and the revised text was committed to the press; but even after the sheets were struck off, the work of criticism went on, and many changes were decided upon in order to bring the text back to the earliest and purest manuscripts. Even in its final form it did not meet the expectation of the Pontiff, who looked forward to a more thorough and extended study of Latin manuscripts, and comparison with those in Hebrew and Greek.

The task of the revisers was not to give a new Latin translation of the Bible, but to produce the best possible edition of the Vulgate, based on the oldest and most correct manuscripts. Keeping this in view, another body of learned scholars, under Clement VIII., made a more thorough revision, and their work, issued from the Apostolic Vatican press in 1592, forms a noble folio volume of 1129 pages. In the preface, the editors declare that it was not "their intention to make a new translation, or to correct or amend the ancient interpreter in any part, but to restore that ancient and Vulgate Latin version, purged from the errors of old copyists, as well as purged anew from the errors of faulty emendations, restore it to its ancient pristine integrity and purity, as far as it could be done, and to print it as correctly as possible according to the decree of the Council of Trent." This edition has remained to the present time the standard edition of the Vulgate in the Church. Though an edition appeared at Rome in 1593, and other editions have appeared from time to time in Rome, none of them have been invested with the authority of this edition of 1592.

Studies of the past centuries have brought to light numbers of manuscripts in Hebrew, Greek, Syriac and Latin, but the work of the revisers under Sixtus V. and Clement VIII. gave the world the most accurate and purest edition of the Vulgate, the Latin version of the Bible to which humanity owes so deep a debt. Studies have never impaired its value; on the contrary, it has been a beacon-light serving to guide many to the truth from which they had strayed. The most recent translations from Hebrew and Greek abandon many hasty changes and faulty renderings of their predecessors, and, guided by the best ancient manuscripts, come back to do homage to the fidelity and purity of the time-honored Vulgate.

# NUMBER OF THE EXTERNAL SENSES: WHAT USE MAN'S REASON CAN MAKE OF THEIR MANIFESTATIONS AS DATA.

**I**S a rational animal having more than five external senses intrinsically possible?

How far can human reason proceed by starting from the facts manifested through the senses as premises, and can it validly conclude from such first premises to a consistent notion of God?

It may be interesting to compare some of the different answers given to these questions, and thereby, perhaps, we may be helped to determine more distinctly which are the only true ones.

Some philosophers have maintained that every man actually has more external senses than five; that man knows what are styled the "common sensibles," which are motion, rest, number, figure, and size, by a special sense distinct from each of the five external senses—the sight, hearing, touch, taste, smell. It has been contended, also, that the "sensible *per accidens*," as it is termed, is perceived or known sensibly by means of a peculiar organic faculty different from each of the five external senses.

But experience attests the fact that if the "common sensibles" were completely separated from every one of the five "proper sensibles," they could not act on sense at all; there could be no sensation of them, for they could have no actual existence as thus separated from all those absolute accidents called "proper sensibles." For example, figure and size cannot be perceived by the senses, nor even actually exist, unless they be conjoined to what is visible, tangible, or at least with what is the special object of some external sense. Even if material substance were conceived to be separated from all its accidents which affect the five external senses, it would then be entirely removed from the sphere of man's natural faculties, and it could not be perceived by him in any manner.

The "common sensibles," or, as called by many authors, with Locke, the "primary qualities of bodies," pertain to the quantity of those bodies; they are modifications of the quantity, are "accidents of accident," and they have no entity as separated from their subject. The sensible qualities of bodies, as color, taste, etc., also have the quantity of bodies for their proximate subject, but they are "absolute accidents," which accede to corporeal substance and extrinsically perfect it. These "absolute accidents" immediately affect

or act on the external senses, and it is on that account they are styled "qualitates alterantes," alterant qualities; for example, the eye immediately sees color, because of color's action on the eye. But the quantity of bodies, as quantity, with its modifications of figure, size, etc., does not immediately act on the external senses; it is only when such quantity of bodies, with these modifications, is invested with the "absolute qualities," or "accidents," color, taste, resistance, etc., that it is capable of affecting external sense. Yet the "common sensibles" or primary qualities of bodies, are not "sensible *per accidens*," for they really and actually affect the external sense by means of the sense's specific object; for example, figure is seen as colored by means of the color.<sup>1</sup>

By the "sensible *per accidens*" is meant, something naturally conjoined to what really and physically acts on the sense, though this object conjoined to it does not itself act on the sense at all, nor is it, in itself, really perceived at all. For example; the orange, as to its *color*, is *visible, per se*, but as to its *taste, smell*, etc., it is *visible only per accidens*; the presence of taste, smell, etc., is shown, and, in some manner, seen by means of the color. The substance of the orange is also sensible only *per accidens*—no sense can directly and actually apprehend its substance.

If the "common sensibles," or "primary qualities of bodies," were really the proper objects of a special sense, distinct from each of the five external senses, then those "common sensibles" should be visible, tangible, etc., only "per accidens;" whereas, they are actually and positively seen by means of color, and felt by means of resistance to touch. The external senses can apprehend quan-

---

<sup>1</sup> St. Thomas, *Sum.*, P. I, qu. 78, ad. 3, a. 2, thus explains the nature and action of "common sensibles" and "proper sensibles": "Sensibilia communia sunt media inter sensibilia per accidens et sensibilia propria, quæ sunt objecta sensuum. Nam sensibilia primo et per se immutant sensum, cum sint qualitates alterantes. Sensibilia communia omnia reducuntur ad quantitatem; quantitas autem est proximum subiectum qualitatis alterativæ ut superficies coloris, et ideo sensibilia communia non movent sensum primo et per se, sed ratione sensibilis qualitatis, ut superficies ratione coloris." That is, "common sensibles" are a medium between the sensible per accidens, and proper sensibles which are objects of the senses. For the sensible, primarily, and of its own action, affects sense, since it consists of alterant qualities. All the common sensibles are reduced to quantity, but quantity is the proximate subject of alterative quality, as surface is the subject of color. Therefore, the common sensibles do not move a sense primarily and of themselves, but by reason of sensible quality, as surface does by means of color.

The scholastics, with Aristotle, divided the category, quality, into four principal species: 1, habit and disposition; 2, power and weakness; 3, whatever in a subject, by its action, causes alteration, and also what results from such alteration; 4, shape, figure, or form. The third species or quality acts, *per se*, and directly on external sense; they are "absolute accidents" of bodies, because they have positive reality of their own, though they exist *per aliud*, or as inhering in their subject, which is corporeal substance. Corporeal substance is not capable of acting on the senses except through these qualities of bodies.



tity as qualified by their respective objects, color, the tangible, etc.; but to know figure, size, etc., determinately and distinctly, requires an act of reason. In dignity, sight ranks highest among the external senses, because of its closest analogy to intellectual perception, and the hearing ranks second; but sight and touch are said to excel the other external senses in certainty.

But is a rational animal, having more than five external senses, intrinsically possible? Some answer, that material substance has, and that it can have, only the five species of quality which man's external senses are capable of apprehending, and therefore an additional sense could have no object. Others argue that no more than the five external senses are possible, and, therefore, no more than five qualities of matter are possible. Two arguments which, if combined, would constitute a vicious circle. The old philosophers seem not to have discussed this question; and hence, the erudite Irenæus Carmelita, who passes over no curious question disputed in the ancient schools, thus disposes of the subject in his "Museum Philosophorum," De Anima, cap. 2, art. 2, sec. 4: "It is usual to prove that there are only five external senses, because of there being only five external things that are actually sensible, *per se*, through our five external senses. But whether or not, by the power of God, there could be more senses, or more sensible qualities in bodies, is not known."<sup>1</sup>

It would surely be vicious reasoning to argue that no other sensible power, except the five, is possible, because no other sensible quality of matter is possible; and to adduce in proof of this that no more than five sensible qualities of matter are possible, because no more than five external senses are possible. Man knows material substance only by way of inference from its accidents; but it cannot be demonstrated, however, that it is intrinsically impossible for God to create an organic power capable of directly apprehending even material substance as subject to quantity.

Locke, book 2, ch. 2, no. 2, after explaining how we can form no distinct conception of a sensible object which was never in any manner apprehended by a sense, concludes: "This is the reason why, though we cannot believe it impossible to God to make a creature with other organs, and more ways to convey into the understanding the notice of corporeal things than those five, as they are usually counted, which he has given to man; yet, I think it is not possible for any one to imagine any other qualities in bodies, however constituted, whereby they can be taken notice of, besides

<sup>1</sup> "Plures non esse sensus externos quam quinque probari solet ex eo quòd plura non occurrant sensibilia externa quæ ad hæc non referuntur. Utrum verò divinitus plures sensus, pluraque dari possint sensibilia, nescitur."

sounds, tastes, smells, visible and tangible qualities. And had mankind been made with but four senses, the qualities then which are the objects of the fifth sense, had been as far from our notice, imagination, and conception, as now any belonging to a sixth, seventh, or eighth sense can possibly be; which, whether yet some other creatures, in some other parts of this vast and stupendous universe, may not have, will be a great presumption to deny. He that will not set himself proudly at the top of all things, may think that, in other mansions, there may be other intelligent beings," etc.

Sanseverino, who maintains that only five external senses are possible,<sup>1</sup> cites a part of this passage from Locke, which he entirely misapprehends, since he understands Locke to teach therein his own opinion, whereas Locke plainly affirms the very contrary opinion. Also, St. Thomas, comparing man as an intellectual animal, to other animals on earth, concludes:<sup>2</sup> "*Anima autem intellectiva habet completissimè virtutem sensitivam*," the intellective soul has sensitive virtue in the completest degree. Sanseverino, who is generally so accurate, infers that St. Thomas thereby affirms man's sentient nature to be the completest that is absolutely possible; whereas he terms it the completest only as compared to all other animal or sentient natures on earth.

Balmes, "*Filosofia Fondamentale*," lib. ii, cc. 17, 18, expresses opinions as to the possibility of more external senses than man actually has, like to those of Locke; and to the objection, if man had another sense it would produce confusion in the knowledge acquired through the five senses which man actually has, he answers that the certainty of knowledge would not be diminished by an additional sense, nor would the essential order and truth of man's ideas be thereby disarranged. Why should there be confusion in the ideas acquired through the ministry of six or more senses, rather than in ideas acquired through five senses?

Tongiorgi says:<sup>3</sup> "Absolutely speaking, a living nature, differently constituted organically from us, might possess more senses, just as, on the other hand, animals less perfect than man are destitute of some sense given to us." So thought Molina,<sup>4</sup> who says: "Finally, according to the number of cognitive powers possible to divine omnipotence, over and above those which God has actually made, so, of equal number in comparison to them will be the kinds or species of knowableness in objects, though those knowable qualities in objects are hidden from us, because of the fact that man is wholly ignorant of such powers."

Dr. Reid's remarks on the senses, considered under this point

<sup>1</sup> *Philos. Christ.*, *Dynamologia*, cap. 2, art. 2.

<sup>2</sup> P. I, qu. 76, a 5; also, *ibid.*, ad. 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Psychol.*, lib. 3, cap. 3, art. 1.

<sup>4</sup> *De Concord.*, lib. Arbitr. cum gratiæ don., qu. 14, a. 12, disp. 38.

of view, are interesting and suggestive; see "Inquiry into the Human Mind," chap. vi., sec. ix., where he explains the "geometry of visibles," referring to the imaginary travels of "the Rosicrucian, Johannes Rudolphus Anepigraphus," who describes science and philosophy as known among the "Idemenians," a people who could reason concerning bodies and space only from knowledge acquired through one external sense, that of vision. Their geometry was only that of perspective, according to which "two parallel lines cannot both be straight lines;" "bodies may compenetrates," etc. In this connection, the similar fable may be mentioned of a conversation between three learned philosophers; one from the earth, with his five external senses; one from the planet Jupiter, with seven senses, having as many proper objects in celestial bodies; and one from the fixed star Sirius, having seventy-seven external senses, with duly proportioned and special objects in stellar bodies. Each one of these philosophers was much surprised to meet with rational beings so differently constituted from himself; and at the conclusion of their learned conference on science and philosophy, the traveller from Sirius assured the less favored philosopher with only five senses, and the searcher after wisdom coming from the planet Jupiter, with his seven senses, that their legitimate conclusions in the sciences were relatively true; though he also added, that their premises were limited, and were deficient in comprehensiveness, owing to their entire ignorance of numerous realities, as to which it was not possible for them, through their few faculties, to form any conception.

The fact is well known, that a person blind from birth cannot conceive the proper object of sight, which is color. His inability to conceive color is, of course, not real proof for him that there is no such object as color, and no such sensible faculty as that of vision. In like manner, our inability to conceive a sixth or an eighth sense and its specific object, affords no positive proof that an additional sense and its object are, in themselves, impossible. It is objected that, if an organic being with more external senses than five were possible, then man could not be rightly styled the "link or quasi-horizon between the material and the purely spiritual orders."<sup>1</sup> This objection implicitly assumes what is in question, namely, is it intrinsically impossible for such "link" or "horizon" to be a rational animal with more than five external senses?

---

<sup>1</sup> This saying had almost the force of an axiom in the schools: "Et inde est quòd anima intellectualis dicitur esse quasi quidam horizon et confinium corporeorum et incorporeorum, in quantum est substantia incorporea, corporis tamen forma," *Contra Gent.*, lib. 2, cap. 68. Such expressions regard what is really beside the present question; they would be equally appropriate if applied to the supposed "philosopher" from Sirius.



Some writers on anthropology and related topics prefer to maintain optimist theories ; teaching a supreme and absolute perfection of man, and of the planet which man inhabits, as compared to all similar creatures that exist or are possible. But what principle can be assigned which limits God's power of creating organic natures to what he has actually created on this earth? What intrinsic contradiction is implied in supposing it possible for God to create organic natures having more than five external senses? As regards such matters, the inspired words of the prophet are suggestive of less narrow and more wise notions of God's omnipotence; after describing God's great and wonderful works visible to us, on the earth and in the firmament, the prophet concludes: "There are many things hidden from us that are greater than these; for we have seen but a few of his works."<sup>1</sup> Since "we have seen but a few of his works," we must, therefore, not be too ready to conclude positively as to all God has done or has not done in the universe, and still less as to what, in such things, he cannot do.

Here the further question might be asked, how far can human reason proceed, starting, as it does, from the facts manifested through sensation as its positive premises? Can man reason from such data to a consistent notion of God? St. Thomas gives the general answer which defines the limits of man's natural knowledge, namely, that "our knowledge takes its beginning from the senses; wherefore, our knowledge can extend only so far as it can be led by means of sensible things."<sup>2</sup>

The human mind can reason from an effect to its cause, essentially and pre-eminently superior to it; and, therefore, it is not true to say that man can conclude from himself as the highest form of creature on earth, only to an anthropomorphous Creator or first cause. Analogy, or proportion of an effect to its cause, which is of a pre-eminently superior order to it, can found demonstration; for, a conclusion may follow demonstratively, even when the medium or middle term has only analogical unity. Identity of species in objects is proved only by similarity of all essential and immutable properties in the inferiors; mere analogy is, properly, of objects which differ in species, and hence no objects can be proved to agree in species by analogy alone. Herbert Spencer, who is peculiar for the ingenuity with which he can devise, and the ability with which he can defend, novel and striking forms of erratic thought, maintains that human reason can derive no higher idea of God from his works positively known to man, than one

<sup>1</sup> *Ecclesiasticus*, 43, 36.

<sup>2</sup> "Naturalis nostra cognitio a sensu principium sumit. Unde tantum se nostra naturalis cognitio extendere potest, in quantum manuduci potest per sensibilia."—*Sum.* P. I, qu. 12, a 12.

which expresses a superior man. He asserts that man, by reasoning from himself, the most perfect being positively known to himself, can conclude to no higher nature as his cause than one possessing his own specific attributes ; and, therefore, God as naturally knowable to man, is anthropomorphous. He illustrates this view of the limits within which he assumes the power of man's reason to be naturally confined, by making the supposition that a watch had the faculty of intellect given to it, and reasoned to its maker. The watch, he contends, could conceive and describe its maker only in terms of watch-springs, wheels, escapements, etc., and thus it could know its maker, at the best, only as a superior kind of watch, but not as transcending the species, watch, in its nature.

To this it may be answered, that, if we assume the supposed watch to have no common or general idea, except the idea of watch, then every thing else would be known by it only in so far as it was "watch," since it could make no distinctions in the species of things, not being able to conceive any object except those included under that one general notion. This is a supposition which is like to one made by St. Thomas, p. 1, qu. 14, a. 6, of "heat," or "light," that would know itself, but have no general idea, except that of "heat" or "light;" on which account it could know other objects only in as far as heat or light.<sup>1</sup>

In order that there be real parity between man and this supposititious watch, the watch must be conceived to have faculties of knowing which resemble those possessed by man. But there is no parity, and nothing follows from the supposition, if the watch be imagined to have no general notion except that of watch, while man, as it must be conceded, knows all the categories, the transcendentials, the principle of contradiction, the norma of valid reasoning, many truths and principles of the positive order, etc., in the light of which he thinks of the universe, and of God as its creator.

As the human intellect cannot validly and truly give univocal predicates to creatures and to God, since the intellect is able to perceive that no terms can be univocal as predicable of God and creature ; so, by parity of reasoning, the intellectual watch should be able to conclude that its maker must be greatly superior to it in perfection, or must possess a higher kind of attributes, for it to be the adequate and sufficient cause of an intellectual watch. It should know also, that its own nature images only, in some degree, the per-

---

<sup>3</sup> St. Thomas, *contra gent.*, lib. 3, cap. 44. imagines a chest (arca), to be endowed with intellect, and to reason from itself to the art required in its maker to design and form it ; he then distinguishes from each other the different manners in which the intellect may use an effect as the medium of concluding to the cause, and thereby acquiring knowledge of the cause.

fections of an absolute first cause, on which its existence depends, and that its existence is not fully and finally accounted for by its proximate second cause, the watchmaker. Nor would the watch's conclusions and affirmations concerning the sufficient first cause of its existence then be necessarily false or inconsistent because conceived and expressed in terms of watchsprings, wheels, escapements, etc. If the watch have not the faculties and knowledge requisite thus to reason unto the absolute first cause of its existence as an intellectual nature, then it has no likeness to man; it is a comparison without parity; it fails to exemplify or illustrate what man can know or do as a rational animal, and thus it becomes an absurd supposition, which only obscures the subject which it is intended to explain. The assertion, "The watch can know only watch, as its maker, and, therefore, man can know only man as his creator," could hold true only in the supposition that each had only one common notion, namely, that of "watch," for the one, and that of "man" for the other; which would be an absurd supposition, leading to no conclusion or knowledge concerning other real beings.

No rational mind doubts the principle that reasoning from an effect to its cause, superior to itself, may be valid or conclusive; nor can any one legitimately deny the fact that the human mind actually acquires knowledge of such causes through their effects. Whenever we infer any such cause from its effect, the illation is through the medium of analogy; as, for example, when the inference is from the design observed in a work of art to the ideal of that work as in the artist's mind. Every cause of this kind is said to be equivocal,<sup>1</sup> and it is necessarily superior in species to its effect.

Though man's idea of God, as the infinitely perfect, expresses God's essence by means of attributes which his reason forms for itself on analogical manifestations of Him in created things,<sup>2</sup> yet he thereby knows God certainly and truly as totally transcending

<sup>1</sup> Do not confound equivocal effect as a medium of inference with the equivocal term; the equivocal term is not a valid medium of illation, but equivocal effect may be a valid medium of illation. As St. Thomas says, *contra gent.*, lib. 1, cap. 33: "In things that are equivocal by chance, there is no order, or respect of one to the other, for it is entirely by accident that the same name is given to the different things. But it is not thus with the same names that are applied to God and to creatures, for in common names of the kind, the order or relation of cause and effect is considered. Therefore, it is not a pure equivocation when something is predicated both of God and of other things."

<sup>2</sup> "Essentiam Dei in hac vita cognoscere non possumus secundum quod in se est, sed cognoscimus eam secundum quod representatur in perfectionibus creaturarum." *Sum.*, p. 1, qu. 13, a. 2, ad. 3. That is: "We cannot know the essence of God in this life, as it is in itself; but we know it as represented in the perfections of creatures."



all finite categories of reality ; and though man knows the infinite in a finite manner and inadequately, yet his knowledge is true.

In reasoning from finite or created beings to God as their absolute first cause, the medium of illation is neither univocal nor purely equivocal ; but it is analogical, which is something between the two ; and such medium founds demonstration.

The agnostic asserts that the following objection against the conclusiveness of such reasoning from created beings to God, is insuperable : " If the medium of demonstration be univocal, then God is proved to be of the same specific nature as the creature ; if the medium be equivocal, no valid conclusion can be derived through it ; but, between the univocal and the equivocal, no third species of demonstrative medium is possible."

As a fact, however, there is a *tertium quid* between the univocal and the equivocal, which is the analogical ; and the human mind does reason conclusively from the equivocal effect to its equivocal cause by means of analogy ; nor is it true that the equivocal effect or cause, as the medium of argument, is the same thing as what is styled in logic " the equivocal middle term in a syllogism," which renders such syllogism fallacious. The human mind daily reasons from an inferior to a superior species or order of reality, by means of analogy ; nor can it be legitimately denied that such manner of progressing from one truth to another may be demonstrative. Besides, this objection against the possibility of demonstration based on analogy, seems to prove too much, since it logically includes the denial of mathematical demonstration founded on the analogies of quantity. The manner in which analogy can possess the unity required to constitute it a valid medium of demonstration, may be advantageously illustrated by mathematical reasoning, since analogies which are limited to quantity are more easily and clearly apprehended, and more distinctly conceived, than are the complex analogies in less simple realities.

For example, if it be said, " six acres : twelve acres :: \$120 : \$240," there is a comparison made between quantities as related to each other only by analogy ; for, grades of entity in " acres " agree with corresponding grades in " dollars " only by analogy. It may be concluded, then, that analogy can found demonstration when the truths compared are mathematical ; a principle which no one can venture to deny. It is also possible for that proportion which is analogy, to found demonstration in other kinds of matter especially when the analogy is that of an effect to its cause, even when the effect is from a cause transcending it in species.

Man first knows the principle of causation by way of an analytical judgment, having necessity and universality. To deny that principle, or require *a priori* proof of it, is to call in question an

axiom ; for it is known as a primitive truth, or one which has the nature of an evident and absolute first principle. It is a well-known truth, also, that every cause marks or stamps its effect with some likeness,<sup>1</sup> or some connotative sign of itself. By means of this character impressed on all effects, man is able to discern the visible things of the universe as effects, to know all *facts* as effects, and to see in them that they do not suffice to account for their own origin, or that they do not contain within themselves the sufficient reason of their own existence.

He can, by reasoning from these visible things, come to the knowledge of God's existence as their first cause ; that He is distinct from them, and that He must be immeasurably superior to them in perfection. No other cause suffices to explain creatures, or to account for their origin. In reasoning of God, the logical order usually followed is, (1) His existence as first cause is concluded from the visible universe ; (2) from His existence as necessary first cause, it follows, that He must be *ens a se*, that is, he exists independently of all cause, or is absolute, and unproduced, "I am who am ;" (3) from His existing as *ens a se* it is inferred that God is pure act, *actus purrissimus*, that is, He can never change from non-action to action, nor *vice versa* ; (4) from His being pure act, as thus understood, it is concluded that He is absolutely immutable, therefore eternal and infinite in every unmixed perfection, for no principle, either intrinsic or extrinsic to Him, can be assigned which limits His perfection. No attempt will be here made to demonstrate the sequence of these conclusions ; the reasoning on them is developed by Aristotle, whose arguments are adopted and elucidated by St. Thomas. *Summa*, p. 1.

In reasoning of God, no predicates are affirmed univocally of created or finite things, and their absolute first cause ; for, the creature is like to the Creator only by analogy. Even in created things, as already said, no attributes are univocally common to effects, as such, and the equivocal cause of those effects. No attributes of any realities belonging to the categories, or any species of created nature, can be affirmed univocally of them and God ; for God transcends all possible categories of created perfection. Yet the human mind can reason with perfect certainty from the proportions or the analogies in created things to the

<sup>1</sup> St. Thomas says, pertinently to this point : "Imago repræsentat secundum similitudinem speciei ; vestigium autem repræsentat per modum effectus, vestigium est, quando res aliqua non est formaliter alteri similis, sed tantum ducit in illius notitiam." That is : "The image represents according to a likeness of the species ; the vestige (the foot-print, trace) represents by way of an effect. It is the vestige, when something is not formally similar to another but only leads to a knowledge of that other."

Likeness, as in an image, does not arise from common accidents, but from proper ones. Figure is the chief element of likeness in corporeal things.

transcendent perfection of their absolute first cause, and thus reach the knowledge of that cause's existence by means of the analogy which intrinsically and necessarily relates created things as effects to their adequate first cause.

Again, to deny that the human mind can, by means of analogy, come to know superior essences or natures, really and truly, from their effects, or that it can thereby reason validly to the absolute first cause of the visible universe, logically necessitates the further denial, that it is possible for the human mind to know any external objects at all, really and truly, by means of its representative ideas of those objects. While man's intellectual ideas, as representative, are likenesses of their external objects, yet they agree in entity or essence with such objects only by analogy. An intellectual idea is a representative likeness of its prototype, or original object; but in its own nature, as a being, it has no specific agreement; it agrees only by analogy with the object which it expresses. It cannot be denied, however, that intellectual ideas constitute the medium of all intellectual cognition, nor that the human mind knows external objects, really and truly, by means of its ideas which represent those objects.

The image of a visible object on the retina of the eye, the phantasm picturing that object in the imagination, and the idea or mental word expressing it in the intellect, are all, in their respective orders or species, genuine likenesses of that object, because they represent it truly and really, or their likeness to the original is objectively real. These representative likenesses, by means of which our faculties know external objects, differ in species from those objects; for, the objects are substances, while these mere likenesses of them pertain to the category of accident. Representative likenesses in the faculties, which are the medium of all the mind's knowledge may be considered under two respects, (1) as objects or entities, having their own species of reality; (2) as representative or vicarious images of objects serving as the means by which the mind knows their originals or the objects represented by them. These representative likenesses agree, as objects or in entity, only by analogy with their originals; for the objects producing them are of an entirely different species, or are, as styled, their "equivocal causes." But when the images in the faculties are considered as representative of their objects, and the means of knowing objects truly, they are formally similar to their originals; or, they are formal<sup>1</sup> likenesses of those objects. For example, the image of a

<sup>1</sup> Suarez, *Metaph. Disp.*, 6, sect. 6, no. 7, denies that the likenesses of objects received by the faculties are *formal* likenesses; he holds that they are only *virtually* like to their originals, as the acorn is virtually like to the tree that grows from it. The schoolmen, however, generally style the likeness in question *formal*, in the sense that



visible tree on the retina of the eye is a formal likeness of the tree, but as an object, or in its entity, it agrees with the tree only by analogy. This explanation of the means by which the mind acquires knowledge being true, we must conclude that it does not know any object external to itself except through the medium of analogy.

The representative likenesses, by means of which the mind knows objects, are formal likenesses which really and truly propose those objects, and the mind thereby knows them directly and truly ; but it does not, in that act, perceive those vicarious images of the objects at all. All human knowledge is thus so dependent on analogy, as the medium through which it is acquired, that to deny the truth or certainty of knowledge because coming through such medium would be tantamount to asserting the doctrine of general skepticism.

The intellect's idea of any sensible or material object must be more immaterial than is that object, since the intellect itself is immaterial, and a subject receives according to its own nature, and not according to the nature of the thing received. The agnostic theory assumes that the intellectual idea cannot be more immaterial than is the image in the fancy from which the intellect derives its idea. In fact, however, the intellectual idea gets its spiritual or immaterial character, not from the object, but from the intellect itself, the idea being its act. The idea derives its objective truth from the thing known by means of it. Hence the Port Royal "Logic," part 1, ch. 1, justly censures the reasoning of those who, in the author's day, inferred God to be unknowable because the human intellect founds its idea of God on sensible forms or representations in the fancy. The Port Royal writer pronounces this to be the same error as that of the anthropomorphists, who fail to perceive that our idea of God, thus formed by the intellect, must be spiritual, and that it expresses God as pre-eminently transcending all material representations. It may be concluded, therefore, that the agnostic theory, as well as that of the anthropomorphist, is materialistic.

According to Mill, "Theists assume the creation of the world by an intelligent cause, and they then reason therefrom to the manifestations of designs in his works ; thus committing the fallacy of begging the question, or, at the best, of reasoning from a mere hypothesis." Such reasoning would surely be preposterous ; but, as a fact, no intelligent believer in the existence of God is guilty of this absurdity. The legitimate reasoning is from the world seen to be an effect possessing evident marks of design, as order,

---

it is objectively true and real ; and this language expresses what seems to be the manifest fact.

adaptations, action towards intended ends, etc., to the intelligence and other perfections necessarily required for the sufficient cause of such effects. This method of reasoning is *a posteriori*, and it is perfectly conformable to the canons of logic; for the human mind knows the nature of an argument from design, even if it does not previously know demonstratively God's existence as the absolute first cause of the world. After proving the existence of God as the intelligent first cause, from His works, then to reason regressively, from Him to His works, is neither unscientific nor illogical, as is evident from the very nature of inductive science. That school of writers may be justly said to "reason from a mere hypothesis" who assume "natural selection together with environment," as sufficiently accounting for all design manifested in the visible things around us. They attribute to this fanciful agency works of design and perfections which they deny to God, and thereby devise "a sufficient reason" of all things, which they ask us to accept, but with no more demonstrative proofs for it than were offered by ancient pagans for belief in the imaginary deities, Fate and Fortune. Man's likeness to the Divine nature is analogical, since God is the equivocal cause of all creatures. But, as before said, while the equivocal effect always differs in species from its cause, yet the mind reasons validly and conclusively from such effect to its cause; indeed, it is doing this always, and it does it with facility; in fact, it is only by this method of reasoning that God's existence as the absolute first cause of the visible universe is demonstratively proved.

Man, as to his soul, is styled the image of God, because he resembles God, according to the highest conception of the Divine nature, that of a perfect, intelligent, or personal being. Man was made *ad imaginem Dei*, to the likeness of God; that is, rather according to an image of God, than according to the essence of God. St. Thomas<sup>1</sup> thus describes this likeness of man to God: "In man there is said to be an image of God; it is not perfect, however, but imperfect. This is what the Scripture signifies when it says man was made *to* the image of God. The preposition "*to*" signifies a certain approach, which befits a thing that is distant. . . . Man is called an image on account of likeness; on account of imperfection in the likeness, he is said to be *to* the image. . . . The image is in man as in a different nature, as the image of the king is on a silver coin." As an image, man is dimly, remotely, and im-

<sup>1</sup> "In homine dicitur esse imago Dei, non tamen perfecta, sed imperfecta. Et hoc significat Scriptura, cum dicit hominem factum ad imaginem Dei, præpositio *ad*, accessum quemdam significat, qui competit rei distanti. . . . Homo verò propter similitudinem dicitur imago, propter imperfectionem similitudinis dicitur *ad* imaginem . . . Imago est in homine sicut in aliena natura, sicut imago regis in nummo argenteo." P. I., qu. 93, a, 1, in c.

perfectly representative of God through analogies, but yet his likeness to God is true according to its own degree. It represents God truly though inadequately; it does so by way of a finite yet comprehensive premise, from which conclusions to a personal God readily come to the mind whenever we ask ourselves the question, what must be the attributes or nature of the absolute first cause, as manifested in his works?

Without here entering into any technical investigation of what analogy is, when considered in itself more strictly, we may justly conclude, it would seem from what has been herein said, that it is irrational to deny its validity as a medium of demonstration. To assert, with Spencer, that our conclusions from the creature to its adequate first cause can reach to no higher being as that cause than creature, would be like to saying that our conclusions from the design manifested in a house can give, for the intellectual ideal of that house, only brick and mortar in the mind of the architect.

This discussion may be appropriately concluded with the following passage from the "Book of Wisdom," ch. 13, which throws much light on the entire subject under consideration: "But all men are vain in whom there is not the knowledge of God; and who, by these good things that are seen, could not understand Him that is, neither by attending to the works have acknowledged the Workman." Then, referring to "the fire, the wind, the swift air, the circle of the stars, the sun, and moon," which the idolaters honored as gods for their "beauty," the inspired text adds: "Let them know how much the Lord of them is more beautiful than they; for the first author of beauty made all those things. Or, if they admire their power and their effects, let them understand by them, that He that made them is mightier than they. For, by the greatness of the beauty, and of the creature, the Creator of them may be seen so as to be known thereby."

---



CARDINAL LAVIGERIE AND THE FRENCH  
REPUBLIC.

## I.

IT was a brilliant summer's day in the month of August, 1888. The streets of Brussels were gay with crowds hurrying to St. Gudules, the great church of the city. The Queen and her court, diplomatists, cabinet ministers, senators and deputies, representatives of the aristocracy of birth and wealth, professors of the university, generals and officers of the army—all were going with the throng. For some of them, it was, perhaps, their first visit to a Catholic Church; but now, side by side with the sturdy burghers of the Capital, they enter in and fill the noble edifice. It was our good fortune for many years to dwell in that dear little land and among her kindly people; it was our privilege more than once to assist at the great solemnities at St. Gudules, but never did we see there a more brilliant assemblage. Yet, indeed, it could not be said that it was a pious gathering, for many who were there would give as a reason for their presence what Cæsar said long ago, "*ut audiamus Ciceronem.*"

And now the preacher ascends the pulpit. His vestments show that he is a dignitary—a bishop—a cardinal of the Church. "*Le voilà, c'est lui !*" there he is ! ran in an eager whisper through the crowd. He stands before them with commanding presence, while the fire sparkles in his piercing eyes. His face inspires veneration, his noble mien respect, while the simple dignity of his whole appearance draws every heart to him in sympathy, in trust and love.

This was Cardinal Lavigerie, Archbishop of Carthage. He belongs to that class of orators whom we recognize as such even before they begin to speak. The interest of the spectators as they looked upon him was heightened by the fact that his name was worshipped even at that time with love and gratitude by millions in darkest Africa, and was a household word in every home in Europe. The great heart of France swelled with pride and enthusiasm as the words of her noble son rang through Notre Dame. England, through her foremost men and most influential journals, had loaded him with honors and covered his enterprise with praise. The largest churches in Rome were filled to overflowing by those who would listen to his words of fire, and now he had just come

from the feet of him whose soul goes out in love not only to Christendom, but to all the sons of men, from the centre of Christianity, whereto even the strong journey to drink of the living waters that ever flow from the rock of Peter. A second Peter the Hermit, Cardinal Lavigerie, was preaching to prince and peasant a new crusade, a crusade against the inhuman slave traders, the routes of whose caravans are marked by the bleaching skeletons of their murdered prey, a crusade in behalf of these wretched victims of avarice and greed, the lowliest of the lowly and the poorest of the poor, a crusade, in a word, to the whole world and to every noble heart in the name of Christianity for the defence of human right.

His speech on this subject in Brussels lasted nearly two hours. From the beginning to the end, the vast audience hung upon his lips. The words of his Master, "*Misereor super turbam*,"<sup>1</sup> "I have mercy on the people," seemed to have filled his soul to overflowing and gave new meaning to every word. And as he described the sad story of this so long unknown land, the sufferings of the slaves, the cruelty of their persecutors, and, on the other hand, the duty of providing against such misery, instinctively our mind went back to that wondrous vision which the prophet saw in the valley of dry bones. It was as if a new Ezechiel were standing over the graves of a buried people and crying out: "*Ossa arida, audite verbum Domini!*" "O ye dried bones, hear the word of the Lord. Thus saith the Lord God unto these bones: Behold, I will open your graves and cause you to come out of your graves, O my people, and I will put my spirit into you and you shall live . . . . I will open the tomb which has so long imprisoned you . . . . for ye also are my people . . . . and I will lead you out from the darkness and a new spirit will I pour out upon you . . . . the spirit of Christ and the spirit of His law."<sup>2</sup>

And not on us alone did the words of the Cardinal make so powerful an impression. The magnetism of his address had by turns touched and edified, moved and electrified all who heard it. "*Quel homme et quelle eloquence extraordinaires!*" "What an extraordinary man, how wonderfully eloquent!" was the verdict of even the most phlegmatic. "*Quel grand cœur et quel langage de feu!*" "What a great soul and what words of fire!" cried they who were moved not so much by his appeal to their Christianity as by their sense of humanity. "*C'est un apôtre!*" "He is an Apostle!" was the brief but pregnant remark of those in whose Catholic hearts the appeal to their charity had found a double echo. And all these opinions were justified; for, in fact, we had

<sup>1</sup> *Marc.*, viii., 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Ezech.*, 37.

been listening to a true apostle and a truly great man ; an apostle, who, in our days, had shown to an admiring world the heroic impersonation of the spending and being spent of St. Paul ; a great man, for he had devoted the most eminent qualities of head and heart to the service of a great idea—the opening up of Christianity to civilization and to Christ.

## II.

This imposing spectacle was brought back to our mind very forcibly a few days ago, when we read the account of the sensation caused by some remarks of the orator of that memorable occasion. A part of the French navy lay in the harbor of Algiers, and Cardinal Lavigerie, on November 12th, invited the officers to a banquet. In replying to one of the toasts customary on such occasions, the Cardinal used the words which were the cause of all the excitement. It was not a sermon or a studied oration, but simply an after-dinner speech. His words were immediately cabled to France, and from France they were despatched to the newspapers on both sides of the Atlantic. The Cardinal had, in fact, spoken for publication, and his remarks were addressed not so much to the officers, whom he was entertaining, as to his Catholic fellow-citizens of France. It produced in them that stupor, mingled with respectful admiration, which always follows the firm and courageous utterance of that which many think, but which no one dares to be the first to express. It was as if a bombshell had exploded in their midst. All lifted up their voices in chorus, some in blame and others in praise. The newspapers were filled with communications, either bitterly denouncing him or lauding him to the skies ; and ever since, the controversy has gone vigorously on, and in café, street and salon the chief topic of conversation is the speech of Lavigerie to the naval officers of Algiers.

Now, what was the nature of this speech which caused all this clamor ? Simply that the Cardinal had declared for the republic. He proclaimed himself a supporter of the existing form of government, and advised French Catholics to abandon their political divisions and to enroll themselves under the same banner. This certainly appears to be nothing but common sense ; there does not seem to be anything very new in it. Here, in America, we can hardly understand why so much ado should be made about it in France. Many prominent Catholics, both of the laity and the clergy, had long before expressed the same sentiments, but their words had made little or no impression. They were not Lavigeries ; their words did not carry with them that weight which is attached to the utterances of truly great men.

To illustrate this, we may recall an anecdote of the great French



writer, Chateaubriand. At one of the famous soirées in Paris Chateaubriand was present, and the conversation turned on the well-known sentiment attributed to Napoleon when an exile in St. Helena. "I have found," he is reported to have said, "many who respected and revered me; but how few have remained faithful and true. Jesus Christ asked men for their love and their love has been given Him in every age and in every clime. I know what a man is, and I tell you that Jesus Christ was not a mere man." Chateaubriand was asked for his opinion on the authenticity of this expression. He read it over and then exclaimed: "How can you doubt it! *Il y a là la griffe du lion.*"

And so in France. When Lavigerie's pronouncement on this long and hotly debated subject was read, every one exclaimed: *Il y a là la griffe du lion!* The impression was heightened by certain expressions in the speech, which seemed an echo of the most authoritative voice on earth. In short, Cardinal Lavigerie's toast was a political programme for his countrymen: *Hic Rhodus, hic salta!* Sincerest love for our Church as well as for our country, impells us to proclaim ourselves loyal supporters of the republican form of government now existing in France.

### III.

That programme, and all the issues connected with it, well deserves our attention. France is facing a future which is uncertain in the highest degree. A great nation with a glorious history—a great people with splendid characteristics, but also with deplorable faults. It is certainly a subject full of the highest interest for those who would trace the ways by which Providence directs the nations; and our Catholic readers will forgive us if we go somewhat into detail in explaining the present condition of a land whose kings once well merited the title "*Rex Christianissimus*," "Most Christian King" a land which once was the *fille aînée de l'Église*," and which to-day supports thousands of missionary and charitable institutions, not only at home but abroad; spending lavishly her treasure on these noble works and devoting to them the best and bravest of her sons and daughters.

When we remember, however, the times of Louis XV., when the upper classes, by their shameless licentiousness, justified the satire "*La France est une monarchie absolue tempérée par des chansons*;" when we remember the infamous propaganda carried on in Europe by the anti-Christian philosophers of the "*Encyclopédie*;" when we recall the horrors of the Revolution and the awful deeds of the Reign of Terror; when we notice that even to-day this great and beautiful land is ruled by the disciples of Voltaire and Rousseau; when we consider all this, we say, we can but admit, that it is the

rod of an angry God which is smiting this people, as St. Paul says : "*Dimisit Deus generationes ingredi vias suas.*"<sup>1</sup>

Still, none the less do these other words apply : "*Et quidem non sine testimonio semetipsum reliquit.*"<sup>2</sup>

The *gesta Dei per Francos* have not been blotted from the page of history ; even in our days are they still continued by pious and high spirited men, by the innumerable charitable institutions which cover the land, by the pioneers of Christianity and civilization in Africa, in Asia, in Australia, and here, even on the outposts of our own America. God, who "*sanabiles fecit nationes,*"<sup>3</sup> has placed all these as witnesses to His Providence in this great nation "*ut quærent Deum, si forte attraherent eum aut inveniant !*"<sup>4</sup> A people of such generous heart will surely not bury the talents which God has given them, but will increase them a hundred fold. This, however, can only be done by France again becoming Christian, Christian in private and in public life, Christian in press and in literature, Christian especially in her government. "*Instaurare omnia in Christo ;*" this must be the motto of those who are called to co-operate in the great work of her regeneration.

Now, of course, it goes without saying, this was the only point of view possible to a Cardinal. But then comes the practical question, how is it to be carried out ? what obstacles are to be removed ? If Cardinal Lavigerie were speaking to an ordinary congregation or addressing a Catholic congress, no doubt he would, in the beginning, proclaim the necessity of obeying the commandments of God and religion, the foundations on which all government rests ; but here he has quite a different means in view to obtain the same patriotic and Christian end. Catholics ought to take more interest in public affairs, they should make their influence felt in politics. This, however, they can only do by combining their forces, and such a combination of forces supposes a single political platform. Now the only platform possible for Catholics is, according to Lavigerie, frank and loyal adherence to the republic.

#### IV.

Here are his own words :

"In presence of the still-bleeding past, and the ever-menacing future, *union* is, at the present moment, our *supreme need* ; and union is also, allow me to remind you, the first desire of the Church and of her pastors in every grade of the sacred Hierarchy. This Union undoubtedly does not require us to blot out the remembrance of past glories, nor to give up those sentiments of

<sup>1</sup> Act. xiv., 15.

<sup>3</sup> Sap. i., 14.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 16.

<sup>4</sup> Act. xvii., 27.

fidelity and gratitude that honor all men. However, when the will of the people has been clearly affirmed; when the form of a government, as Leo XIII. recently proclaimed, contains nothing contrary to the vital principles of Christian and civilized nations, when, to save one's country from the destruction that threatens it, firm adhesion without any mental reservation to that form of government becomes necessary—the time has come to finally declare the experiment made—to put an end to our divisions; and to sacrifice all that conscience and honor permit, and command even, each one to sacrifice for the country's good.

“This is what I teach all around me and what I desire to see taught in France by our entire clergy; and speaking thus, I am sure not to be reproved by any authoritative voice.

“Besides this resignation, this patriotic acceptance, nothing can preserve peace and good order—save the world from social peril—and save even the religion, of which we are the ministers.

“It would be folly to hope to sustain the columns of an edifice, without entering into the edifice itself, were it only to prevent those who would destroy everything, from accomplishing their evil purpose; folly above all, to keep aloof, as some still do, notwithstanding recent shameful occurrences; thus giving our ever vigilant enemies the spectacle of our dissensions or our hatred, and instilling into the heart of France discouragement, the forerunner of the greatest calamities.”

## V.

We shall not stop to discuss the question whether a good Catholic can be a loyal supporter of a republic as well as of a monarchy or any other form of government. For Catholics, there is no room for controversy. The explicit declarations of the Popes, and the most elementary notions of the origin and universality of the Church, place it beyond all question. To refute seriously the allegations of certain of our adversaries would be doing too much honor to what is either the densest ignorance or conscious insincerity. We are too often apt to forget that bad faith never lays down its arms, and we thus fall into skilfully-laid traps, making ourselves playthings for those who strive to hide their hate by claiming a monopoly of patriotism. It seems to us that Catholics on both sides of the Atlantic have erred too long by an excess of simplicity and condescension. “*Claudite iam rivus, sat prata biberunt.*”

Neither are the principles of *public right* in question in the present case. Certainly, France is the last country in the world where the appeal should be made to Legitimism—to the hereditary right of a certain family to possess the supreme power. Not only have



the French more than any other people contributed to spread the doctrines of popular sovereignty, but they have put the principle in practice in choosing the many forms of government they have experimented with, since the great revolution of 1793. Again, all French pretenders whether Royalists or Imperialists, Orleanists or Bonapartists, all recognize more or less openly the inherent or acquired rights of the nation.<sup>1</sup> *Legitimism*, in the old sense of the word, is buried in the tomb that contains the mortal dust of a man who was too kingly to be a king. Cardinal Lavigerie has therefore reason to say that the republic now existing—established after the fall of Sedan, Sept. 4, 1870, and since confirmed in all the popular elections, is the government which the country has legally chosen. But there is more than that; not only has the republic become the legal form of government according to the principles of public right in vogue in France, not only can it retort on the pretenders the maxim "*scienti et volenti non fit iniuria*," but it can also now invoke a certain prescription against those who at first denounced its founders as usurpers. In fact this charge of usurpation comes very badly from the defenders of modern right and is refuted most thoroughly at least as far as France is concerned by the events which led up to the reigns of Louis Philippe and Napoleon III. But this apart, the natural law itself declares that the possession of authority, which at first was but a matter of fact, may, in certain cases, to safeguard the good of the whole people, become also a matter of right. For it can easily happen, by reason of the lapse of time and divers other circumstances, that the establishment of another government would be hurtful or morally impossible, not only in the present but even in the future, and in such a case, the public good would demand that those in possession should be con-

---

<sup>1</sup> With regard to the question of the origin of the sovereign power in civil society one may certainly hold the theory of those who say that it comes mediately from God; immediately from the community. According to this opinion, the power resides radically in the people, and is given by them to one or more persons in a manner more or less integral, absolute and irrevocable. This opinion is supported by many great theologians, Bellarmine, Suarez, Molina, Lessius, St. Alphonsus; and has never been reproved by the Holy See. Certainly no one can deny that it is possible for the power thus to reside in the people, but it is entirely different, to say, that it must so reside. Leo XIII. has touched on this question in several of his encyclicals, notably, in "*Quod Apostolici muneris*," "*Diuturnum*," "*Humanum Genus*," "*Immortale Dei*," and his teaching seems rather to favor those who affirm that power is conferred immediately by God on rulers, and that the people have only the right of designating the particular persons who shall rule, but that the people do not confer the power on them.

It is unnecessary to state that the theory of the exclusively human origin of the sovereignty of the people, as formulated by Rousseau, and proclaimed, as a matter of public right by modern agnosticism, is as anti-social as it is anti-Christian. It is simply founded on social atheism.

sidered to be so lawfully, according to the maxim: "*salus publica suprema lex.*"<sup>1</sup>

But now, is this the case at present in France? Here we reach the real question which must be decided by the actual condition of the country and it is on the actual condition of the country that Lavigèriè takes his stand and bases his conclusions. One does not need to be deeply versed in politics to see that events have so changed in France that the re-establishment of the monarchy is a Utopian dream—a dream which may be cherished as a theory but which day by day becomes more impossible to be realized.

We do not mean to say that the republic as it is, that is to say, as it is ruled by the present majority of the chambers, is such as to inspire Catholics with confidence and satisfaction, or that it has

---

<sup>1</sup> The term "prescription" is not altogether exact in this case, as our learned friend, Dr. Bouquillon, remarks in his renowned *Theologia Moralis Fundamentalis*, i., p. 162: "Quemadmodum contingere potest ut auctoritatis possessor, qui prius legitimus erat, postea evadat illegitimus, nempe ratione privationis, indignitatis, incapacitatis et impotentiae, ita vicissim contingere potest ut detentor illegitimus decursu temporis evadat possessor legitimus: hoc autem fit, non per viam proprie dictæ præscriptionis, sed per viam cuiusdam amissionis (déchéance) ex una parte, et collationis in favorem alterius partis: Ubi notandum est, *per se* facilius amitti auctoritatis possessionem quam rerum dominium; cuius ratio est, quia rerum dominium est in utilitate domini, auctoritas autem est in bonum communitalis. Dicimus *per se*, nam aliter loquendum est de casu quo auctoritas alicui exercenda tradita fuerit in finem sublimiorem: exemplum est in principatu temporali S. Sedis."

This last sentence contains the reply to the objection which may be drawn from the principles of natural and public law against the necessity of the Temporal Power of the Pope. The Holy Father and the Catholics of the whole world protest against the present situation in Rome, not only because the King of Sardinia forced his way into that city by the breach at Porta Pia, and consummated his usurpation by the most shameless robberies and by the violation of the most sacred rights, but also and more especially because of the divine power and divine mission of the Holy See. God Himself has given to the successors of St. Peter supreme spiritual power; God Himself has willed and ordained that this power be exercised in full and complete liberty and independence; that His Vicar should not be in any way the subject of a temporal prince, who is, or ought to be, his faithful child; and all this for the *greatest good, not of a single nation only, but of the whole church, and consequently of all the nations of the earth.* Now the Temporal Power of the Pope is the *means* chosen by Providence to secure the free exercise of Papal authority, and this means is, especially in the present condition of affairs, the indispensable condition of the independence and liberty of that authority. Therefore, the right of the Popes to a territory of which they would be rulers is inviolable and exempt from all prescription, not only because they have held it legitimately for twelve centuries, *but also and above all because this power is so intimately connected with the divine prerogatives of the Popes and consequently with the spiritual interests of the whole church.* Here, then, we apply the maxim, *Salus publica suprema lex, i.e.,* the usurpation of power by a prince, were it even with the consent of a nation, cannot become legitimate by any title, when it is *in opposition to the interests of a higher order*, namely, the spiritual, when it is opposed to the *good of all Catholics*, and is injurious to the well being of the *whole Church.* The immense importance of this question merits a far longer explanation, which cannot be given here. We hope, however, to have the opportunity of treating it later on in a distinct article.

conquered its adversaries or won them over by its conciliatory action. Certainly not. On the contrary, it has done everything it possibly could to make itself hated by those of its citizens who have any regard for their most sacred rights, and has given every possible pretext for its overthrow. Reckless squandering of the public funds, arbitrary intolerance of every description, shameful corruption in politics, open violation of the sentiments of the majority by religious persecution—all these things have been done in the name of the republic, and if it stands to-day, it is not the fault of the republicans. But the republic is in possession and this in itself is an immense advantage; it requires ten times more strength to capture a position than to defend it, and what party is there just now that is so sure of support from the country as to attempt such an undertaking?

The *Orleanist* family have not even all the royalists with them. Some can never forgive Philippe Egalité for his share in the condemnation of Louis XVI. Their anxiety for the safety of their possessions at a time when France was drained of her treasure under the Prussian sword, and their intimate relations with the great barons of Jewish finance have raised many protestations and awakened much opposition. Finally, during the late Boulangist agitation, the monarchists were so mixed up with this band of theatrical adventurers that even those who kept their hopes the highest understood that all was ended. The letter of the Count of Paris taking on his own shoulders the blame of this compromising alliance was an act of political honesty, but it has not bettered the situation. On the contrary it was to use a French expression: "*le P. P. C. de la royauté.*"

Among the *Imperialists*, Prince Jerome is more to be feared by Catholics than men like Ferry, Clemenceau or Constans; and in fact he has about as little desire to possess the throne as France has to give it to him.

As to Prince Victor, we do not know whether he adopts the principles of his pious mother, Princess Clotilde, or follows those of his father. All we know of him or of his political career is summed up in certain letters of thanks or congratulations addressed to various Bonapartist committees. It would be imprudent to base hopes on this young man which his past record gives not the slightest promise of ever being realized.

The Republic alone remains, and, it would be childish to deny it, it grows stronger every day, in the same measure as its opponents are becoming more and more feeble and disorganized.

Jules Simon, one of the most intellectual men of our times, and at the same time one of the most competent judges in this question, has written an article in the December number of the *Forum*,



1890, entitled "The Stability of the French Republic." In his usual clear, precise and perspicuous style, with all the authority given by his age, experience, and former position as member of the Cabinet, he sets forth the history of the Third Republic, describes its domestic and foreign policy, and enumerates the enemies with whom it had and still has to contend.<sup>1</sup> As an impartial man and judicious observer of events, the celebrated rationalist openly condemns the vexatious and annoying measures by which Catholics have been justly "irritated and exasperated." He bears noble testimony to the unyielding firmness with which the Church defends all questions of doctrine, and also to the broad and conciliatory spirit which she displays in all matters of pure politics. "These quarrels, wantonly stirred up and profoundly to be regretted, are not irremediable. The policy of the Catholic Church is not one of rancor; it adapts itself to accomplished facts and makes the greatest possible use of them in its own interest. It is inflexible only with regard to dogma."

He concludes thus: "To sum up, the Republican establishment seems solidly constituted. It has all the organs of life and duration. . . . it is stronger to-day than at its beginning. But its principal strength lies in the increasing weakness of its enemies. . . . The Republic has now no longer enemies before it; or, if it has any, they are Republican enemies."

The great writer and the great Cardinal had certainly not consulted, before giving to the world, the one his article, the other his manifesto, yet their more immediate conclusions are absolutely identical. We say "their more immediate conclusions," for Jules Simon naturally confines himself to giving wise advice to the present government, to follow more moderate councils, which advice may be summed up in the famous words of Thiers, "*Nous n' avons plus aucune faute à commettre*;" while the Cardinal has principally in mind to bring about the union of Catholics, to persuade them to abandon their profitless and empty hopes, and to work together in the republic usefully and efficaciously for Church and Fatherland.

Cease to antagonize the Republic; you work without hope of success and you are wasting your strength. If the Republic is now mistress of France, if it has abused its power to work injury

<sup>1</sup> "Between 1780 and 1890, we have had in France a very respectable number of Governments. Not one of them has lasted beyond fifteen or sixteen years, except the third Republic, which but a few days ago entered on its twenty-first year. The Republicans do not hesitate to say that the Republic is now permanently established; and I believe this to be true, first, because the Republic has already lived so long, and secondly, because neither of the two monarchies by which it is threatened is in a condition to seize the power. Even if one of these should usurp the government, it would not have a fortnight to live."

to the Church and to religion, it is our own fault, the fault of our quarrels and of our inactivity. Let us support, not the men who actually govern the republic, but the principles embodied in the republican form of government. Let us support the Republic, that in our turn we may become its governors. Let us unite under its flag, that under the protection of that flag we may have entrance to the Chambers. We shall go there at first a minority, but a minority strong enough and energetic enough to make ourselves respected. . . . it will depend on our own efforts to become the majority. Then, when that comes to pass, the radical and atheistic republic will have had its day, and Catholic France will be governed by a Catholic Republic.

Such, it seems to us, is the idea of the Cardinal. It is thus it has been understood by the most authoritative Catholic journals of France, particularly *L'Univers*, *La Croix* and *La France Nouvelle*. "Yes," writes the latter, "it is our wish to follow the policy of union. . . . it is our desire to labor for the religious and social peace of our country, which our political disunion destroys; we are willing to do our share in hindering much evil and in making the Republic, in spite of certain republicans, a government in the true sense of the word.

The *Figaro* itself, the organ of all opinions and of all amusements, finds the words of the Cardinal very much to the point. It laughs scornfully at the "*grands seigneurs*" of the aristocracy, who are continually crying to the clergy: "*Luttez! luttez!*" "fight on! fight on!" while they themselves spend their time complacently in the diversions of the salons, the hunting field or the race course. Now it happens that this class of Catholics who would counsel and rule the Church are not at all pleased with the words of Cardinal Lavigerie. They declare, as Saint Genest tells us in the *Figaro*, "that in spite of cardinals and archbishops they will never submit to the republic!" However this may be, it is certain that the words of Cardinal Lavigerie were addressed in the first place to the aristocracy and the "*haute bourgeoisie*" of France. In spite of all its faults, the aristocracy still wields an immense influence in society, and it is now its duty to make true the motto, "*Noblesse oblige.*" It obliges them to show the most complete devotion, and to make the greatest sacrifices, when the interests of religion and country are at stake. They style themselves "Conservatives," and call themselves the "Ruling Classes," "*les classes dirigeantes*;" but they should bear in mind that vague protestations made in the corner of a drawing-room never "conserve" anything, not even honor, and that the *ruling classes* should rule something else than a coursing match or a cotillon. The following is the advice given by Saint Genest in a moment of unaccus-

tomed frankness to his aristocratic friends: "Let them go to the Nuncio and say to him: 'We have resolved to take our part in the great struggle for religion and fatherland; from the large cities, even to the smallest villages we will fight for our Church and our country. We will change our way of living. We will say good-bye to luxury and to pleasure. We will live for fighting, like the Prussians in 1806. You may tell the Holy Father that he can depend on us!'" Then Saint Genest adds: "Let them say that, and you may be sure that the clergy will be extremely happy to cease making the concessions they are forced to submit to now. But while they go on in their present fashion of crying, 'fight on, fight on!' as they return from a ball or leave the theatre, or hurry to the race course, the Nuncio would only repeat what a certain Italian prelate once said to Leo XIII.: "Les francesi, bien aimables, mais un piou farçours!"

We had already written the above when the latest news from Europe proved that the sensation caused by the Cardinal's manifesto had reached the proportions of a historical event. His Eminence himself, in a letter addressed to the editor of *La Croix*, of Amiens, has given us a further explanation of his ideas. This document shows that the Cardinal had not raised his rallying cry without having asked Leo XIII. for his advice beforehand, and thus there was additional reason for our first commentary: "*Il y a là la griffe du lion.*" "A sufficient experience," he says, "was necessary to confirm our resolution, and moreover the voice of an authority, which we are bound to obey, has spoken." The Cardinal insists on the teachings of the Holy Father, especially those contained in the Encyclical "*Sapientiæ Christianæ*," to prove to his fellow-citizens, that in the present circumstances the efficacious defense of their rights under the flag of the only government which is now possible, to wit, the republic, is not only useful and desirable, but also obligatory and necessary. It is not our intention to discuss here those delicate questions which touch the domain of conscience. It is enough to have mentioned the fact here, that thus we may give full and entire expression to the ideas of the Cardinal, whose noble and majestic figure inspired the preceding pages. We will only add that the sentiments of filial respect and submission with which such a man speaks of the teachings of the Vicar of Christ, and strives to put them into execution, should touch and edify, strengthen and rejoice every Catholic heart.

We will now sum up the argument which we have endeavored to set forth in this article, and which we believe to be the basis of the Cardinal's manifesto.

Many Frenchmen, and notably the French Catholics, have



deemed it their duty since 1870 to oppose the republic and declare themselves monarchists.

As long as there was any reasonable hope that the monarchy might be restored, this policy was not only not reprehensible but was even praiseworthy, especially considering the abuse of power committed against church and country by the masters and representatives of the republic.

But now, after twenty years of experience, by the mistakes and divisions of its adversaries, the pretenders and their adherents, the republic still exists, and has even struck its roots deep in the hearts of the people. It is become impossible to overthrow it. The monarchy has no longer any chance of being re-established, and even if it were it could not last.

Therefore it is Utopian to continue to dream of such a re-establishment; to continue to cherish this hope is an useless and sterile policy.

It is more; it is injurious in the highest degree to the interests of religion and country. It exiles Catholics, and among them the most influential men in French public affairs. It hinders the union of all the conservative forces in the country, a union which is the indispensable condition of useful and efficacious political action. In the meantime, the enemies of religion hold on to power and use it against us, while we could be in their place, and could give Catholic France a government at once patriotic and Christian.

Union, therefore, must be our motto, and in order to union we must agree on one programme. The only programme possible is for us to declare openly and without any reservation that we accept the republic; that is, the republican form of government—that we do not dream of overthrowing it. Separated we are powerless, united we shall find strength; we shall be able to defend our rights and make our opponents respect them. And we shall be in a position to hinder the war of hate which atheistic ministers wage against the Church in the name of the republic. Sooner or later, we ourselves shall direct its destinies, and then we can give to France a republican government, fair and honest and worthy of her present and her past.

Doubtless there are, in the last letter of the Cardinal, certain remarks on individuals which we may very well be excused from adopting. Moreover, some of his conclusions are open to question; moreover, he does not pretend to give an official interpretation of the Encyclical of the Holy Father; and we can easily comprehend the hesitation and distress of certain eminent French Catholics whose loyalty to the Holy See is above all suspicion. Therefore, it is our opinion that the last word has not yet

been spoken on this great event on which depends in great measure the future of France.<sup>1</sup>

## VII.

We have just examined the comments of the French press as far as time and opportunity allowed us, and nowhere have we seen the reasoning given above seriously refuted. It is true there has been a good deal of eloquent declamation against "this detestable, abominable, insupportable government which styles itself the French republic"; but this only strengthens the resolution of those whose programme it is to combat the men who have made the republic so, to drive them from the ministerial benches, to cast them from their seats in the senate and in the chamber, and even from the presidential chair, in a word, to capture their republic and make it ours. Others waste time and ink in describing in a most charming and enthusiastic manner what the monarchy would have done for France, as though in politics any one ever relied on *futura conditionata*, as if these posthumous jeremiads were not a humiliating confession for those who did nothing to prepare for that future, while as yet there was time. Other lamentations of the same nature are well refuted by Saint Genest, whose sarcastic yet common-sense advice we have quoted above. Some have tried to prove that the Cardinal is inconsistent. They have recalled the fact that once he was the friend and confidant of the Comte de Chambord. A former Secretary of this worthy scion of St. Louis has published a letter addressed by the Archbishop of Algiers to Chambord in 1874 in which he urges him to come to France at once and proclaim himself king. But the Cardinal has never made a secret of his sympathy for Henry V., a sympathy which honors both the one and the other. He even speaks of it in his last letter. To this very day he regrets that the king did not take his advice. But this man, a true king in heart and character, is now no more. Even if he were still alive he could not blot out the sixteen years which have passed since then. He could not undo the fact that even the idea of a monarchy has almost disappeared from the French people, as Mgr. Isoard, Bishop of Annecy, remarks in a letter in which he declares his adherence to the Platform of Lavigerie. The publication of a private letter of the Cardinal by a third party has only proved two things—first, that the former secretary was not above com-

---

<sup>1</sup> [A letter of Cardinal Rampolla written by order of His Holiness to one of the French bishops in the last few days comes to us most opportunely, as it shows that the writer was not mistaken in his conjecture that Cardinal Lavigerie knew full well that the stand he had taken would meet with the full approbation of the Holy Father.—ED.]

mitting a breach of confidence, and, second, that he understands neither the logic of facts nor the logic of the Cardinal.

We were not a little astonished to see Paul de Cassagnac gravely lecturing the Cardinal to the effect "that Catholics may abandon a political interest, but not those of the faith." Here it is really difficult *satiram non scribere*. Cassagnac has been a redoubtable opponent of the republic. His bold and independent attitude in the chamber classes him amongst the most interesting men in France. His caustic and inexorable pen will always secure readers for his paper among all parties; but when a man has acquired the reputation, rather unenviable for a Christian, of being the best duellist in France, and consequently has saddled himself with a good score of excommunications, it would be certainly more becoming in him to make his contrition more and more perfect than to explain the gospel to a Cardinal, especially when that Cardinal is such a man as Lavigerie.

Nothing has been passed over in the Cardinal's toast. His critics have weighed every word in the balance to trip up the speaker. We will mention one other objection; for its refutation will give our readers a deeper insight into the present condition of the political parties of France and show still more clearly the opportuneness of the Cardinal's declaration. How can Lavigerie, they say and they write, recognize the republic, "*sans arrière pensée*," without reservation? Is not that the same as swallowing at one gulp not only the republican form of government but also the republic as it now exists with all its principles and laws? We have found this objection urged even in the more serious stamp of newspapers. Therefore, in the presence of the highest representatives of the French navy, by telegraph and through the press, in the presence of France and all Europe, an archbishop has publicly and solemnly canonized the grandmaster of the masons, Constans, and company, the champions of atheism! They are determined not to understand the Cardinal, thus to escape his inexorable logic. That logic tells them unmistakably: We must raise the republic openly and honestly on our banner; we must not enter the chambers, we must not seek influence in the government in order to accomplish a *coup d'état* and then open the gates of Paris to the Count of Paris and place him on the throne. Such a reservation would not be honest, would be irreconcilable with a republican platform. That express declaration of the Cardinal was not intended as a trap, nay, it was necessary, taking into account the conditions of the various political parties as they now are in France. Representative Piou, an honorable and most clever member of the Chambers, has in our day tried to unite the Catholics of the various political parties in France. His pro-



gramme was and is as follows: We are before all else Catholics; our religion suffers persecution at the hands of the republic and we are doing nothing against our persecutors and we can do nothing as long as we remain disunited. Some of us are Orleanists; others Jeromists; others still Victorists or Republicans. We must build up one party if we wish to defend our religion. Let us therefore allow each one to remain true to this or that dynasty, to the monarchy or to the republic, but let us call ourselves the "Christian Party," and as such let us take our place openly in the Chambers. Such a motion was certainly good; it would have brought forth good fruit and gathered together under its flag men of renown, many of whom are in the Chambers always ready to defend the rights of religion.

But that programme was imperfect, and therefore not plain enough. Piou went only half way, and so could gain no influence as a political party, whether for himself or his followers. And why? For two reasons. First, a great portion of the people had no confidence in such a party. The vast majority of the French nation are sick and tired of revolution. The monarchy deceived their fondest hopes. The country desires peace, especially internal peace. Voters, therefore, said to such candidates: It is true you are Catholics, but you intend to overthrow the government; that means violent convulsions over again; it means the shedding of blood, and for the last hundred years we have suffered enough from this constant change and the consequent insecurity. We cannot, therefore, recognize you as men deserving our confidence in political matters.

The second reason is found in the stand taken by the government, which knows full well how to manipulate cunningly the voting against Piou's party. Whenever such Catholics rise in the Chambers to complain against the persecution of the Church and religion, immediately the cry is raised from the ministerial benches or those of the majority: Who are you to complain? It is not we who are stirring up the country. It is you; for who are you? the bitter enemies of the republic; openly and secretly you are working for its overthrow. You are in truth Revolutionists. And now you say you are speaking in the name of Catholics! If so, then are Catholics the sworn enemies of the republic, and you expect us to be so simple and foolish as to treat them as friends? Would it not be insane for us to furnish weapons and to guarantee all freedom to those who are thinking only of turning those weapons against ourselves and the republic?

We need not remark that this answer has its perfidious and intolerant side, but it cannot be denied that in the mouths of supporters of the government it has its justification. At all events, it

is a fact that Freycinet and Rouvier, Fallières and Constans, have made use of it with good effect ; and it is likewise a fact that they have thus gained their end, that of compromising the Catholics in the Chambers before the country as enemies of the republic ; nay, more, even in the eyes of good Catholics. Piou, indeed, retorted well : But we stand on the ground of the republic as well as you ; we do not protest against it. Is that so ? They answer back : You come to us and creep into the house of the republic, in order, at a given moment, to throw into it your dynamite bomb, to set it on fire, and then on its ruins, to press the scepter into the hand of your emperor or king. This state of affairs filled the episcopal and patriotic heart of the noble Cardinal with anguish. He looked for a remedy. He called to mind particularly the words full of wisdom of Leo XIII., and said to himself : No special form of government is of its own nature Catholic ; why should we Catholics constantly stretch forth our hands praying for a monarchy, especially when it has become an impossibility and the people will have none of it ? That is not the way of the Catholic Church. She considers human affairs from a higher standpoint. *The welfare of souls must take precedence of the welfare of dynasties.* This is why the Cardinal gave his toast, and this is why he wrote his letter. This is why he gave the finishing touch to Piou's programme, made it complete instead of a half measure, and proclaimed : "*Adhérons à la République sans arrière-pensée !*" True, we do not approve of the disgraceful laws of our present Republicans, but we will fight against them, vizer up. We will assure the nation that we mean peace ; and that republican institutions will be defended honestly and honorably by us. Then will the nation trust us, and, as the champions of the Catholic people, we will in all measures carry our flag aloft, and enter into the house of the republic. Then will they be forced to listen to us in the name of the free republic. Having once disciplined our forces, we will be able to make the house a most comfortable dwelling. Freedom and public and social peace shall dwell therein more than ever before. When that day shall come, then will every Catholic be glad to live under the republic ; *then will they have saved France !*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> To show the honesty of his conviction in the clearest manner possible, the Cardinal, immediately after his toast, asked the band to play the national hymn of the republic, the well known Marsellaise. No wonder that this has been made a special matter of reproach to the Cardinal, for the Marsellaise had its origin in the bloody days of the Revolution of 1793. In answer to this we might quote : *Cum duo faciunt (canunt) idem, non est idem.* All that Lavigerie intended, as he himself expressly declares, was, that thereby he acknowledged his complete adherence to the present form of government. His Eminence might have remembered that the truly catching and delightful melody of the Marsellaise had in reality an ecclesiastical and Catholic origin. Rouget de Lisle, to whom, as the supposed author of the same, several statues

To express our own views: it is our decided conviction that the logic of the Cardinal, both from a political and from a religious point of view, is unanswerable. If, in spite of all, it be still objected, French Catholics are no longer Catholic enough or powerful enough to form a compact, united party with any hope of success in the battle against the wicked republic and for the establishment of a good republic—then indeed is the whole question not only vain and useless but unworthy of consideration. Then for France as a nation we would only have to write the epitaph: *Finis Gallicæ Christianæ!*

Others there are, who, unable to rise to the high plane occupied by the Cardinal, reproach him, as being more African than French. They say that he is ignorant of the political situation in France—that he is flattering the government in order to gain its assistance in his anti-slavery crusade; that he speaks with passion, etc. The poet has well described the attack of the pigmies on Hercules. This description is a sufficient answer to such attacks:

“Alcidem Pygmea propago,  
Ridet, et ingeminat turba proterva jocos.”

Let us place alongside of this the picture of the great French apostle and patriot drawn by the facile pen of Jules Simon: “Admiral Duperré has called him the apostle of Africa. He should have said, the apostle of civilization. Men like Lavigerie are worth a whole system of philosophy in spreading civilization. Men like him are as good as an army in increasing the prestige and the influence of their country.”

However the matter may end, the Primate of Africa will always have the honor of being the first to bring into the sphere of prac-

---

have been erected in France, copied the whole tune from an oratorio composed in 1787 by the choir-master, Grisons, of Saint Omer. One of the editors of the *Univers*, Arthur Loth, in a pamphlet published some years ago, proved this fact beyond question.

The same objection might be urged against the beautiful national hymn of Prussia, which, if we are not mistaken, owes its origin to the Revolution of 1848, and therefore is tinged also with democracy, *e.g.*:

“Nicht Ross, nicht Reisige  
Sichern die steile Höh,  
Wo Fürsten stehn!  
Fühl in des Thrones Glanz  
Die hohe Wonne ganz  
Liebling des Volks zu sein,  
Heil König dir!”

We have, however, never heard or noticed that this circumstance has anywhere done injury to the loyal feeling for the Prussian monarchy, which is so strong, and justly so, in that country.



tical politics the important question, the solution of which is so necessary for France ; and to his courage is due the initiative of a great movement, which may perhaps mark the beginning of a new era for that noble and glorious land.

Doubtless Lavigerie has displayed some passion in this struggle *pro aris et focis*, as he has displayed it in the great enterprise which has placed him in the front rank of the French episcopate and of the great men of the period. He is certainly possessed by a master passion, by which he is consumed, and which absorbs his every power. All his eloquence, all his strength, his whole soul are in that passion for Jesus Christ, Whose name he has carried into the desert of the Sahara and Whose reign he would re-establish in his beloved country. It is this passion which fills him with the indomitable courage and untiring energy, which make heroes and conquerors.

---

## HENRY C. LEA AS AN HISTORIAN.

*Chapters from the Religious History of Spain Connected with the Inquisition.* By Henry Charles Lea, LL.D. Philadelphia : Lea Brothers. 1890.

MR. LEA in this, the last work that has come from his pen, treats of two entirely distinct questions. The first portion of the volume is devoted to the Censorship of the Press, the second treats of Mysticism. Under the Censorship of the Press we have thirteen chapters, or rather essays, entitled : "The Middle Ages," "Rudimentary Censorship," "The Reformation," "The Spanish Erasmists," "The Scriptures," "Organization of Censorship," "Functions of the Inquisition," "License for Readers," "Independence of Rome," "The Regalistas," "Censorship by the State," "The Revolution," "The Influence of Censorship." Mysticism is treated in six chapters, under the headings, "Development of Mysticism," "Dangers of Mysticism," "Persecution," "Impostors," "Molonistas," "Endemoniadas," which are supplemented by the two essays, "El Santo Niño de la Guardia," and "Briandi de Bardaxi." To the whole work, thus outlined, there is an appendix containing nine documents.

It is our purpose in this article to examine some of the subjects treated by Mr. Lea, which are of especial interest to us ; but, be-

fore doing so, we think it well to make a few observations which may serve to throw light on the author's method of working and enable us to rate him at his true scientific worth.

Mr. Lea's work has every appearance of being the production of an erudite author—of one who carries research to its fountain-head. Of the 192 pages devoted to the Censorship of the Press, only 19 appear without at least two or three foot-notes giving references to authorities—frequently to books and manuscripts of the time when the facts related took place. We have always deemed it a duty when judging of the industry of an author and of the confidence which he may merit, to verify such references as he makes. This we have tried to do for Mr. Lea's work, as far as the resources of a single and very limited library would permit. We here set down some of the results of our examination for the edification of our readers.

On the very first page, the author quotes the "Apostolic Constitutions." He refers us to Lib. I., c. 7. This reference is wrong; it should be c. 6. He cites the text as follows: "Abstine te ab omnibus gentilium libris. Quid enim tibi cum externis libris vel legibus vel falsis prophetis: qui quidem leves a fide abducunt." The quotation is also wrong; it should be: "Ab omnibus gentilium libris abstine. Quid enim tibi cum alienis sermonibus, vel legibus vel falsis prophetis; quæ quidem et homines [leves] avertunt a fide." *ἡ τῶν ἐθνικῶν βιβλίων πάντων ἀπέχου. Τί γάρ σοι καὶ ἄλλοις λόγοις, ἢ νόμοις, ἢ ψευδοπροφηταῖς; ἃ δὲ καὶ παρatreπεί της πίστεως τοὺς [ἀνθρώπους] ἐλαφροὺς."*

Evidently, Mr. Lea has not seen the original text, or, if he has, his edition must be extremely imperfect.

Were we now treating of the question of censorship, we would have to examine whether the Constitutions as quoted, lay down a law or simply state a counsel, and, consequently, whether this provision can be characterized as "the earliest censorship and perhaps the most sweeping?" We would have, also, to ask the author why he has not given at least a hint, as to the verdict of modern criticism regarding the age of these Constitutions, instead of confining himself to the bald statement, "which purport to be written by St. Clement of Rome at the dictation of the Apostles."

Mr. Lea surely knows that the Apostolic Constitutions are, in the first place, not older than the third century; secondly, that they have never had the force of laws; and thirdly, that the Latin Church has always treated them with very little attention.

Mr. Lea is certainly too learned to render it necessary for us to refer to modern critics, such as Beveridge, Cotelier, etc.

On page 25 we are referred to a decision of the Fifth Lateran Council, sess. ix. (it should be sess. x.). Mr. Lea remarks: "In the acts of the Council the suspension threatened from business is for

a year, but no duration is specified in the decree as embodied in the *Corpus Juris*. (Septimi Decretal., lib. v., tit. iv., c. 3.)" As a commentary on this extraordinary note we would state:

1. That there are two collections which are called "*Liber Septimus Decretalium*," one made by the Lyonese lawyer, Pierre Matthieu (*Petrus Matthæus*), the other made by order of Clement VIII. To which of these collections does Mr. Lea refer? A careful author would know and make the distinction.

2. That if Mr. Lea refers to the Collection of Clement VIII., then his reference is inexact; for, at the place indicated there is no decree of the Council of Lateran. We have not had the opportunity of examining the text of Pierre Matthieu.

3. That neither the collection of Pierre Matthieu nor the collection of Clement VIII., belong to the *Corpus Juris*; moreover, they have of themselves no legal force. Mr. Lea seems to have forgotten that the *Corpus Juris* is made up of the Decree of Gratian; the decretals of Gregory IX.; the *Sextus*, published by Boniface VIII.; the Clementines of John XXII.; the *Extravagantes* of John XXII., and the *Extravagantes Communes*. Moreover, of all these, only the Decretals of Gregory IX., the *Sextus*, and the Clementines, have any value in law.

The knowledge of canon law is absolutely necessary for any writer who wishes to treat Church history in a serious fashion. Many indications make us suspect that Mr. Lea is not quite familiar with this science. If he were, he would hardly have quoted the *Corpus Juris* in this wise: "*Lib. iv. Extr. vii. 12,*" for *Lib. iv. tit. vii., 12*. A glance into an elementary manual of canon law would have shown him that authors never cite the "*Corpus Juris*." The proper thing is to quote the "*Decretals*," the "*Sextus*," etc.; again, when quoting the Decretals we must remember that they are divided into books, titles, and chapters, but not into *extravagantes*. Of course, we understand that this is only a slip, but while one or two slips may be passed over, a large number of such slips excite a suspicion against the author who has had the misfortune to be guilty of them.

On page 44 Mr. Lea writes as follows: "Whether Ferdinand and Isabella prohibited translations of the Bible has been a disputed question. At the Council of Trent, Cardinal Pacheco stated that they had done so with the approval of Paul II., but as Paul died in 1471 and Isabella did not succeed to the throne till 1474, the assertion was evidently a random one, deserving of no weight. Alfonso de Castro, writing in 1547, while arguing against the popular use of Scripture, says that Ferdinand and Isabella prohibited, under very heavy penalties, its translation or the possession of translations, but gives no reason for such a law having



fallen into desuetude. The "*Repertorium Inquisitionis*," printed at Valencia, in 1494, says that it is forbidden to translate the Scriptures into the vulgar tongue, but it bases this exclusively on the prohibition of Innocent III., to the Waldenses of Metz, in 1199, which had been carried into the Corpus Juris and was familiar in that shape to Jurists. . . ."<sup>1</sup>

Now what are we to think of the argument thus stated? A cursory examination shows us:

1. That the Cardinal did assert in the Council of Trent that there was a prohibition in Spain against translating and reading the Bible in the vernacular and that this prohibition had been confirmed by Paul II., but he did not assert that the authors of that prohibition were Ferdinand and Isabella. Consequently, the observation as to the date when Paul II. died and Isabella ascended the throne is quite irrelevant. The text of Pallavicini to which Mr. Lea refers us, Lib. vi., c. 12, n. 5, says simply this: "Cumque Pachecus objiceret, id fuisse in Hispania interdictum, etiam Paulo II. comprobante, respondit Madruccius, . . ." etc. There is no mention of Ferdinand and Isabella here, neither do their names occur in the report of the debate printed by Leplat, tom., iii. mon. 278, p. 396.

2. Alphonsus a Castro wrote his book "*Adversus Hæreses*" not in 1547 as stated above, but in 1534. This blunder is inexcusable; for if Mr. Lea had given himself the trouble to read the preface to the edition of 1556, he would have found there this precious indication: "Ut ergo huic tam late grassanti morbo vel aliqua ex parte qua possem mederer, ante viginti duos jam elapsos annos, anno videlicet tricesimo quarto supra millesimum quingentesimum, opus quoddam edidi quatuordecim partitum libris, in quo omnium, hæresium, quæ post Christi in cælos ascensionem in Ecclesia fuerunt ortæ, certissimam primo rationem reddere curavi, etc." We have gone more particularly into this matter of detail as Mr. Lea seems to attach a good deal of importance to it. In fact almost every time he mentions Alphonsus a Castro he carefully adds "writing in 1547."

3. We have not been able to consult the "*Repertorium Inquisit.*" of 1494, but we have before us the work of another Spanish Inquisitor almost contemporary—"Tractatus de agnoscendis assertionibus Catholicis et Hæreticis," by Arnaldo Albertini. This is what he has on the subject, quæst. 28., n. 35 (p. 183, Venice, 1571.): "Arbitror optima ratione a generalibus inquisitoribus Hispaniæ sancitum esse ne quis Bibliam vulgaris lectionis habeat legatve, cum experimento compertum sit hinc multa scandala et pericula animarum esse suborta."

<sup>1</sup> Lib. iv., Extra, vi., 12. Innocent PP. III. Regest, ii., 141, 142, 235.

4. As to the alleged prohibition of the Bible to the Waldenses of Metz, we shall prove later on, that no such prohibition is found in the letters 141, 142, 235, of Innocent III. Here, we will however remark, that in any case no vestige of such prohibition is contained in the decretal referred to by Mr. Lea. He should know that in the decretals, what makes law is not the document from which the text is taken, but the text alone. Now we repeat that the text cited by Mr. Lea does not forbid the reading of the Scriptures, and the canonists who have commented on it, see no prohibition there. The only prohibition in it is against preaching, holding conventicles, despising priests, etc. Mr. Lea can inform himself on this point by consulting for example Abbas Panormitanus and Felinus among those who wrote before the Council of Trent, and Barbosa among those who wrote after the Council.

5. Finally, if we were now treating the question whether Ferdinand and Isabella did issue edicts concerning the Spanish version of the Bible we would inform Mr. Lea that Cardinal Pacheco and Alphonsus a Castro are not the only authorities who have affirmed this fact. Here, for example, is the testimony of Miguel de Medina in his work "*De Recta in Deum Fide*," written during the Council of Trent and published at Venice in 1564: "*Ego vero de vulgaribus versionibus prohibendis, nullam ecclesiasticam aut theologam, præter unam Concilii Tridentini, quæ maximis de causis facta est, ad petulantiam nimirum hæreticorum coercendam, sed tantum Christianorum principum sanctionem invenio, qui ecclesiastico zelo suis regnis providentes, cum multa mala ex iisdem vulgaribus versionibus reipublicæ proventura putarent, quorum aliqua ipsa jam experientia probarat, omnes præter unam Latinam eliminari jusserunt. Id profecto apud nostram Hispaniam a catholicis regibus Ferdinando et Elizabetha eo ipso zelo quo inquisitorios magistratus, unicum fidei certissimum columen, instituerant, factum fuisse eorum regnorum pragmaticæ sanctiones et historiæ testantur.*" Lib. vii., c. 10.

We might easily lengthen this series of critical observations. Others with more means at their disposal may carry out the work of verifying the references with much profit. We believe, however, that we have said enough to show that we cannot put absolute confidence in Mr. Lea's erudition. We would add that many indications convince us that the learned writer has not seen the greater part of the works which he quotes with such imperturbable assurance. We believe that we are not unjust in saying that he has gathered his quotations here and there, right and left, and everywhere, at second hand. For example, we find on p. 22, n. 1; p. 44, n. 4; p. 207, n. 4, a work styled in one

place "Albert. Repertorium Inquisit.," in another place "Repertorium Inquisitionis," in a third place "Repertorium Inquisitorium." Mr. Lea informs us that this work was printed at Valentia in 1494. But what is its exact title? Is it "Repertorium Inquisitionis" or "Repertorium Inquisitorium?" Evidently if Mr. Lea had before him something more than an abridged citation he would not have varied as he has. We have consulted the bibliographies for this work, and we have found the following mentioned: "*Repertorium (anonymi auctoris) de pravitate hæreticorum et apostatarum, examinatum emendatumque per doctorem Michaellem Albert Valentinum. Valentiae, 1494, in 4.*"—" *Repertorium Inquisitorium pravitatis hæreticæ, in quo omnia quæ ad hæresum cognitionem et sacræ Inquisitionis forum pertinent, continentur, correctionibus et annotationibus. Quintiliani Mandosii ac Petri Vendrameni decoratum et auctum. Venetiis, Damianus Zenarus, 1588, in 4.*" (*Migne, Dict. de Bibl. Cath.* tom. I, col. 1024; tom. III, col. 1123).

Again, it is never allowed any author to indicate the titles of the works to which he refers in the extraordinary way Mr. Lea does. Thus, on p. 66, the title of Simancas' book is given by him "De Catholicis institutis;" but it is "De Catholicis Institutionibus;" the title of Paramo's work, p. 67, n. 1, is given by him *De Orig. Officio S. Inquis.*, but it ought to be "De Origine et progressu Officii sanctæ Inquisitionis," etc. The one and the same work of Luis de Grenada undergoes the following remarkable philological metamorphoses: at p. 49, n. 2, it is "Dell' oratione et meditatione;" at p. 223 "Trattato dell' oratione et della meditatione;" and at p. 224, n. 2, it has dwindled into "Oratione et Meditatione." Mr. Lea cites on page 294 the works of Rodriguez and De Puente, which have been translated into every language. He gives the titles in Spanish in n. 2: "Ejercicios de la perfeccion," and adds: "I quote from the translation by Antonio Putignano, Venice, 1627;" then, in n. 4 "Guid spiritual," and again he adds: "I quote from the translation by the Abate Alessandro Sperelli, Rome, 1628." Why is he so scrupulous here? Why then when there is question of the work of Molinos or of Butler's Lives of the Saints, does he give without any remark at all the titles of mere translations? Again, in the titles which are given in the original languages, we find as many mistakes as words. We would remind Mr. Lea that it is not customary in Latin to say Alfonsus de Castro or Richardus de S. Victor. He should have written Alphonsus a Castro and Richardus a Sancto Victore. We would also remark that the person condemned to death by the Parliament of Paris in 1529 was not called Louis de Berquier (p. 32), but Louis de Berquin; that the collection of Bulls (Latellier) is not of the year 1797 but 1697 (p. 104, n.), etc.



If any more examples are required to substantiate the assertion made above, we have only too many to choose from. Mr. Lea often cites the Spanish Index but he does it in a manner which betrays his method of working. Thus, p. 74, n. 1, we read "Indice Expurgatorio, Regla, xvi.;" a little further on, p. 81, n. 3, 4, it is "Indice di Sotomayor;" and on p. 82, n. 1, we have "Indice expurgatorio de Quiroga," 1584 (Ed. Saumur. fol. 99-100). Are there any works which bear these titles? No. There is an "Index librorum expurgatorum Cardinalis Gasp. Quiroga jussu editus" and an "Index librorum prohibitorum et expurgandorum novissimus pro Catholicis Hispaniarum regnis Philippi IV., Antonii a Sotomayor inquisitoris jussu et studiis recognitus," etc. What, then, does all this mean? Simply this, that Mr. Lea, writing in English, refers us to a work the true title of which is in Latin. Now this title he gives us not in Latin, as would be natural and scientific; not in English, which would be excusable; but in Spanish! Evidently Mr. Lea has taken his quotation from some Spanish author. What would be said of a Frenchman who would quote in German the title of a work which only existed in English?

Like observations might be made on his manner of quoting the Roman Index, the Bullarium, etc. But we have something more remarkable still. In the second part, on Mysticism, Mr. Lea surpasses himself and gives the most convincing proofs of his peculiar manner in amassing references. For example, is he not taken *flagrante delicto*, on p. 219, n. 1, where, wishing to cite the Abecedario of Francis of Osuna, he naïvely writes, "*Francisco de Osuna Tercera parte del libro llamado Abecedario Spiritual.*" Indeed! Suppose a Spanish writer of a book for Spanish readers should literally make the following reference: "H. C. Lea, Third Part of the Book called a History of the Inquisition," would not every intelligent Spaniard conclude that the writer had never seen Mr. Lea's book, but had taken the reference bodily from some English book written for English readers?

Again, our author likes to refer us from time to time to some MSS. This, no doubt, gives the book an appearance of great erudition and solid historical research. But suppose these references are taken at second hand? Again, why send us to "MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, No. 218 b, fol. 214" (p. 68, n. 1), or to the "MSS. of the Königl. Universitäts Bibliothek of Halle, Ye. 20, T. xi" (p. 51, n. 1), for something that is known to historians for more than 200 years, and for which the text of the MSS. can be found in writers more easily accessible? For instance.

on p. 98, n. 5, we are again referred to the "MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, 216 fol."<sup>1</sup>

Let us see now, whether at least he makes proper use of the documents quoted by his authors, whether he states facts exactly, and whether he gives solid proof for his statements. To ascertain this, we shall make an examination of a few but quite important subjects.

### *I. The Church and the Reading of the Bible.*

Mr. Lea treats this question, especially in its bearings on Spain, in his first chapter, "The Middle Ages," and in the sixth, "The Scriptures." He states that in the middle ages, the Church was content with the Latin Vulgate, and authorized no translations into the vulgar tongue, and, as proof of this, he appeals to the decrees of the Council of Toulouse, in 1229, and the Council of Tarragona, in 1234 (pp. 16-17); a little further on, he expresses his surprise that, in spite of these decrees, the Inquisition threw no obstacles in the way of the publication of Spanish versions (p. 19). He then goes on to say that Innocent III. forbade the Waldenses of Metz to translate the Bible into the vernacular, and that this prohibition of Innocent was carried into the Corpus Juris (pp. 44, 45); but, at the same time, he seems to hold with Castro and others, that before the Council of Trent there was no ecclesiastical prohibition. He writes that by the decree of the fourth session of the Council, "vernacular versions were not specifically forbidden, but their production and use were effectually interfered with." (pp. 47, 48). He states that Charles V. paid little attention to this decree, but that Spain received it, and the manner in which she used it stifled all biblical study (p. 48-50). Finally, he is of opinion that the discipline of the Church on the reading of the Bible by the faithful is now altogether different from that of the Council of Trent, and he bases his opinion on the Pastoral Letter of the Bishops of the last Council of Baltimore (p. 162, n. 2).

Such is the history of this question, according to Mr. Lea. We proceed to give the history according to the facts:

#### 1. The Church holds that the reading of the Scriptures, while

---

<sup>1</sup> N. B.—Are there 216 folios of MSS. in that library? Or, does it mean on folio, *i.e.*, page 216? If so, in which MSS. must we look for that page? Or, is fol. the same as No., as would appear from p. 68, n. 1? In support of the statement that "In 1514, at the suggestion of Cardinal Ximenes, Ferdinand had ordered that no papal bull or rescript should be published without preliminary examination and the royal approval." What a grand discovery made in that MS. Pity that the same thing is mentioned by nearly every Catholic writer on the "Placetum regium," or in particular on the "Jus supplicandi" of the Spanish kings, while the text of that royal order may be found in full, as early as the beginning of the 17th century in Salgado's "*De Supplicatione ad Sanctissimum*." But we have already seen enough to convince us that Mr. Lea deals extensively in second, or perhaps, third hand quotations.

not absolutely necessary to the faithful, is, however, very useful. To be useful, though, certain conditions must be verified, namely, that they use a pure and unadulterated text; that they have a faithful translation, and that they come to the reading of it with good intentions and with a fitting preparation. This principle is recognized and stated from the very first centuries, in almost every page of the writings of the Fathers. In the middle ages it is set forth by Innocent III. in his letter to the Bishop of Metz (Epist. 142); it is inculcated by the great mystical writers of Spain in the 16th century, Louis of Granada and L. De Puente—which causes Mr. Lea such unnecessary astonishment—and it is the same principle to which the bishops refer in the Pastoral Letter of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore.

2. In this matter it is easy for abuses to arise, and they did arise very soon. The conditions required for profitable reading were often absent. Every one knows the complaint of St. Jerome in his letter to Paulina (Epist. liii. ad Paulin, n. 16). "Farmers, masons, carpenters, workers in metal or wood, cloth-makers, fullers, do not learn their trades without masters. . . . The art of explaining the Scriptures is the only one which all arrogate to themselves. The babbling old woman, the dreaming old man, the wordy sophist, all, in a word, tear it in pieces and teach it without having learned it. Some with lofty airs and bombastic speech hold forth on the Scriptures to an audience of women. Others learn from women what they are to teach to men, and as if this were not enough, with ready eloquence, or rather audacity, explain to others what they do not understand themselves." "*Hæc a me sunt perstricta breviter ut intelligeres, te in scripturis sanctis sine prævio et monstrante semitam non posse ingredi. . . . Agricola, cœmentarii, fabri, metallorum lignorumque cæsores, lanarii quoque et fullones, et cæteri qui variam supellectilem et vilia opuscula fabricantur, absque doctore non possunt esse quod cupiunt. . . . Sola scriptura ars est quam sibi omnes passim vindicant. . . . Hanc garrula anus, hanc delirus senex, hanc sophista verbosus, hanc universi præsumunt, lacerant, docent antequam discant. Alii aductu supercilii, grandia verba trutinantes, inter mulierculas de sacris litteris philosophantur. Alii discunt, proh pudor, a feminis quod viros doceant, et ne parum hoc sit, quadam facilitate verborum, imo audacia edisserunt aliis quod ipsi non intelligunt.*"

St. Gregory Nazianzen goes further: He wished that the Church would regulate the use of the holy Scriptures. "It is necessary," he says, "to have among us a law like that which was formerly enacted by the Hebrew doctors. They forbade the young to read certain of the sacred books, the reading of which was hurtful to their yet tender and inconstant minds. Likewise, it would



not be well to allow indifferently to all and at all times permission to discuss the meaning of the Scriptures, but only to certain intelligent and learned persons, and that only at certain times. This permission should be refused to those who are animated with an insatiable curiosity or urged on by desire for glory, or who are given to piety with an indiscrete zeal. . . . Then the multitude may be cured of its disease of disputation and drawn to less dangerous pursuits in which idleness will cause less loss and in which insatiable avidity will merit only praise." S. Greg. of Naz., Orat. xxxii, n. 32 (tom i., p. 600 Edit. Ben.).

3. In spite of the particular abuses mentioned so often by the Fathers, the Church took no general measures for twelve centuries to regulate the diffusion and use of the sacred books. She allowed full liberty to all to translate the Bible into every tongue, so that Eusebius of Cæsarea could affirm (Orat. de Laud. Constant, c. 17), no doubt with some exaggeration, that the New Testament had been translated into all the dialects of the Barbarians. St. Jerome (Præf. in Ev. ad Dam.) observes that it is easy to prove the integrity of the sacred text by comparing the numerous versions made in ancient times. We have still some parts of the Gothic version of Ulfilas. Hardly had men begun to form the modern tongues when versions of the Scriptures appeared in them. It is said that in 706, St. Adhelm translated the Psalter into Saxon, that the Ven. Bede translated the whole Bible into the vulgar speech of England towards the year 735, etc. With regard to the faithful, they were left to their conscience and the discretion of their particular pastors.

4. The first attempt at restrictive legislation was provoked by the excesses of the Waldenses and Albigenses in the 13th century, and was published in the Council of Toulouse, 1229, and at the convention of Tarragona, in 1234. The Council of Toulouse is very severe. "*Prohibemus ne libros veteris testamenti aut novi, laici permittantur habere, nisi, forte psalterium, vel Breviarium pro divinis officiis, aut horæ Beatæ Mariæ aliquis ex devotione habere velit. Sed ne præmissos libros habeant in vulgari translatos arctissime inhiibemus.*" The convention of Tarragona is much less strict; it only forbids versions in the Romance dialect: "*Statuitur ne aliquis libros veteris vel novi testamenti in Romanico habeat.*" We must carefully note here (*a*) that the letters of Innocent III. with regard to the trouble at Metz, do not contain any prohibition against reading the Bible in the vulgar tongue; on the contrary, the Pope explicitly states that: "*desiderium intelligendi divinas scripturas et secundum eas studium adhortandi reprehendendum non sit sed potius recommendandum.*" (Epist. 141). He also wishes that before taking harsh measures the Bishop of Metz

should find out "quis fuerit auctor translationis illius, quæ intentio transferentis quæ fides utentium, quæ causa docendi." (Epist. 142).

(b) We may remark, secondly, that in the Corpus Juris and particularly in the fifth book of the decretals, tit. vii., ch. 12, there is not even a word of prohibition with regard to the reading of the Bible, and that the great canonists have never discovered any such prohibition there.

(c) Thirdly, we must bear in mind that the decrees of Toulouse and Tarragona are particular and local decrees drawn up to meet special needs, and consequently never had any general force and are of no permanent value. What shall we say, then, to the extremely sweeping statement of Mr. Lea: "The Church was satisfied with the Latin Vulgate; it authorized no translation into modern tongues" (p. 16); by which he intends to convey the impression that the Church never permitted the use of such translations. We are also astonished that a man as learned as Mr. Lea still admits the existence of the Waldensian Bible. That Bible has long passed into the legendary class. It is a myth of which nothing now remains to be exploded. On this point we would beg to refer him to "S. Berger, La Bible Française au Moyen age," p. 35.

(5) The decrees of Toulouse and Tarragona, made to meet a local and transitory danger, were so far from indicating a general prohibition that, almost immediately after, there appeared in divers countries, notably in France and Spain, new translations, not of a single book only, but of the whole Bible. Mr. Lea bears witness to the fact for Spain, and he gives himself much needless surprise at the toleration of the Inquisition (p. 19). It is well known that during the reign of St. Louis, a complete translation of the Bible was made into French, and that less than fifty years afterwards, Guyart Desmoulins completed a second version. It was the same in other countries.

(6) To find any more legislation with regard to the reading of the sacred books, we must come down to the time of Wiclif. He had made for his followers a translation, or, rather, a rough paraphrase of the Bible. The Council of Oxford, held in 1408, with Thomas Arundel as president, forbade all the faithful to use it. It also prohibited the undertaking of a new version of the sacred books without the express authorization of the bishops: "Statuimus et ordinamus ut nemo deinceps aliquem textum Sacræ Scripturæ auctoritate sua in linguam Anglicanam vel aliam transferat, per viam libri, libelli aut tractatus, nec legatur aliquis ejusmodi liber, libellus aut tractatus jam noviter tempore dicti Joannes Wyclif sive citra compositus, aut in posterum componendus, in parte vel in toto, quousque per loci diocesanum, seu si res exegerit, per con-

cilium provinciale, ipsa translatio fuerit approbata" (Labbe, xi. 2095).

7. The invention of printing naturally multiplied the editions of the older versions and stimulated the making of new ones. Before 1518 we have no less than fourteen complete translations of the Bible in High German and five in Low German. But the most enlightened minds of that epoch were not slow to question the expediency and utility of putting the whole Scriptures in everybody's hands. The famous John Geiler, of Kaisersburg, in his "*Peregrinus*" invites the pilgrim to drink "of the water of wisdom which springs forth to eternal life, that is to say, the waters of the divine word contained in the vessel of the holy Scriptures. But," he adds, "take care that you drink only that which the angel of the Lord will give you and according as he commands. For there are some who drink of this water according to their own good pleasure and without restraint. They do not take it from the hands of the angels of God who are the priests of Holy Church. They pretend to wish to explain the Holy Scripture as they please, as do the Waldenses, the Brethren of the Free Spirit, the Hussites and other heretics" ("*Peregrinus*," fol. xv., J. ap. Dacheux, Jean Geiler, p. 229). Again, he almost regrets that the Scriptures were in his time translated into German. "I allow thee the reading of it," he says, "I admit that thou hast at home interpretations and glosses; but thou shalt not draw it therefrom either with pleasure or profit if thou hast not beforehand acquired the indispensable science of understanding it; without preliminary study thou shalt go astray. . . . Therefore, in reading the Bible, take care that thou dost not lose thy way." (Ap. "Jansen, Hist. du Peuple Allemand," Fr. trans., tom. i., p. 584.) It was in conformity with these principles that, in 1486, the Archbishop of Mayence, Berthold de Neuneberg took certain measures to guard against the dangers arising to the faithful from imprudent reading of the sacred Scriptures. Thus, he appointed commissioners at Mayence, Erfurt and Frankfort, and ordered them to supervise the printing of the Bible.

8. The situation was aggravated by the development of the Reformation, and it is not surprising that the Sorbonne condemned the exaggerated statements of Erasmus, urging everybody indiscriminately to read the Bible. The theologians of Paris recognized in their condemnation that the sacred books are holy in whatever language they appear; but they say that it is not proper to put them in everybody's hands or to allow them to be read by all sorts of people without explanations, particularly by ignorant and simple persons who abuse them and do not read them with that piety and humility which they ought to have. In his reply, Erasmus acknowledges that it is necessary for those who read the



Bible to be well disposed and submissive to their pastors and to the Church, and he concedes that the reading of certain books should not be allowed those, who, it is foreseen will abuse them.

With regard to versions, things came to such a pass that Luther himself, Chemnitz, Whittaker and Robert Stephen deplored the immense number of often faulty translations. (See the texts in Becanus, tit. Evang., n. 42-45.) Theodore Beza declares that it will soon be all over with the Scriptures if the craze for translation is not checked: "Cui libidini audaciæ nisi occuratur, nae, aut ego vehementer fallor, aut intra paucos annos, paulatim ipsarum quoque rerum possessione depellemur." (In. c. 10, Act. Apost.)

9. It is not, therefore, surprising that in the Council of Trent the Church thought of regulating this matter, which, with the exception of local and temporary decrees, had so long been left free. It is remarkable, however, that though the debates before the fourth session bore on a large number of questions, and notably on the reading of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, nevertheless the decree, "De editione et usu sacrorum librorum," contains but four points, namely, the authenticity of the Vulgate, the order that it be printed, the prohibition of interpreting the Bible against the *consent* of the Fathers, the prohibition to print, sell or keep books which had not been examined by the bishop, and finally forbidding the sacred books being put to unbecoming uses.

(a) Therefore, contrary to what Mr. Lea states—"Vernacular versions were not specifically forbidden, but their production and use were effectually interfered with," p. 47; the Council neither explicitly nor implicitly forbids or interferes with the reading of the Scriptures to the faithful, no matter in what language.

(b) Consequently, what Mr. Lea says about the want of respect manifested by Charles V. for this prohibition is without foundation. "It is true that Charles V. made light of this, when, to meet the clamor for reform in Germany, he caused the adoption of the *interim*." Charles V. could not make light of a decree which did not exist. Moreover, the text of the "Formula Reformationis," c. xiv., n. 4, is in no way opposed to the spirit of the Church, whether before, during, or after the Council of Trent. "Legat populus libros sacros, sanctos patres, vitas sanctorum, historias præclarorum et fortium virorum."

(c) We will add that Mr. Lee simply rehashes a calumny, when he says that the Council of Trent, by declaring the Vulgate *authentic*, virtually declared it *inspired*, "A decree in which the character of inspiration was virtually attributed to the Vulgate, pronouncing it authentic," p. 47.

(d) Moreover, it is but another calumny, and a stale one at that,

to pretend that according to the decree of Trent, the Vulgate cannot be in any way corrected, "and not to be rejected or corrected under any pretence." Since Mr. Lea devotes himself to Church matters, the laws of justice command him first to read his documents and then to interpret them fairly.

10. If, however, the Council in 1546 had published no decree on reading the Scriptures in the vernacular, eighteen years after the fourth session, and sixteen years after the *Interim*, a law was enacted by Pius IV., in 1564, on this subject. It is the famous third and fourth Rules of the Index. "As experience has shown that the reading of the Bible in the vulgar tongue, if it is permitted to all without distinction, causes, by reason of the rashness of men, more evil than good, therefore let each one in this matter submit to the judgment of the Bishop or Inquisitor, who may, on the recommendation of the Parish Priest or Confessor, permit the reading of the Holy Bible translated by Catholic authors into the vulgar tongue, to those whom they shall judge capable of being strengthened in their faith and piety by such reading, rather than being injured by it." Such, then, is this famous decree. Let us see what it forbids.

(a) It prohibits the reading of Protestant translations or editions of the Scriptures.

(b) It forbids reading the Bible, even in Catholic versions, without having obtained permission from competent authority.

On the other hand, it allows the faithful, without any restriction—

(a) To read the Bible in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament and in the Greek of the New, in the Septuagint and all the oriental versions, in the Latin Vulgate.

(b) Moreover, it permits all the faithful who have received a general or special permission to read approved modern versions in the vulgar tongue. Such being the exact meaning and bearing of the decree, it is not astonishing that the most orthodox mystics, like Louis of Granada and Luis du Pont, should have incessantly recommended the reading of the Scriptures to those of the faithful who were desirous of advancing in perfection.

11. The Holy See has at several times revised the application of this rule of the Index. It is true that Sixtus V. and Clement VIII. have intensified its strictness by reserving to the Holy See permission to read the Bible in the vulgar tongue; but this reservation, called for by the neglect of certain bishops, did not last long. The Holy See granted the Ordinaries the faculties which they had before. It, in fact, made the matter much more easy. Benedict XIV. extended the permission of reading the Bible beyond the limits drawn by his predecessors. In 1757, he approved of a

decree of the C<sup>o</sup>ngregation of the Index by which the faithful were allowed to read the Holy Bible in the vernacular, provided the versions were authorized by competent authority or were accompanied with notes drawn from the writings of the Fathers or Catholic authors: "Quod si hujusmodi Bibliorum versiones vulgari lingua, fuerint ab Apostolica Sede approbata, aut edita cum annotationibus desumptis ex SS. Ecclesiæ Patribus vel ex doctis Catholicisque viris, conceduntur." Pius VIII. confirmed this decree in 1829.

By these modifications, Rome has not given proof of inconsistency, as Mr. Lea thinks, p. 47, not. 3; she has constantly held the same principles, which are, after all, nothing but the principles of common sense and natural right; she has only applied them in different ways so as to meet different circumstances.

12. Spain received the decree of the Council of Trent and the Rules of the Index conformably to the general laws of the Church; she severely repressed the editions, versions and annotations of the Bible, made by Protestants. She exacted the correction of suspected books before allowing them to circulate; she did not allow to all the reading of the sacred books, even when translated by Catholics. It was not necessary for Mr. Lea to spend six or seven pages to tell us that. But is it true that this discipline rendered all development of Biblical study impossible in Spain? "Subjected to such shackles, and exposed to such discouragement, it is easy to understand how impossible became in Spain the development of Biblical learning." We cannot imagine how a man, so conversant with religious literature as Mr. Lea pretends to be, could venture to make such an assertion. During the two centuries, from 1480 to 1659, not only letters and science in general, but Biblical studies in particular, flourished in Spain with a luxuriance such as no other nation has ever seen. Of the four great Polyglots which the learned world possesses to-day, Spain has the glory of having, by her unaided efforts, produced one, and having had the greater share in the production of another. The great Spanish and Portuguese commentators, Pereira, Gasp. Sanchez, Pineda, Ribera, Foreiro, Villapanda, Maldonado, Francis de Toledo, Salmeron, and many others, have come down to our own time, and will always be counted in the front rank. Their only rivals are their Flemish contemporaries, fellow-subjects of the king of Spain, T. Bonfrère (Bonfrerius), A. Maes (Masius), Corn. Jansen (Jansenius Gandavensis), Francis Lucas of Bruges, W. Van Este (Estius), Corn. Van den Steen (a Lapide). Now all these great critics and interpreters were formed, and worked, and wrote, at the very time when the legislation mentioned above was strictly observed; nay, the majority of them, even after the Council of Trent,



and during the reign of Philip. To a reflecting mind, nothing can destroy the significance of these facts. To diminish their importance would certainly require more than a few anecdotes gathered here and there by Mr. Lea, such as the statement attributed to Luis de Leon (p. 52), that there were many theologians who did not possess a copy of the Bible; or the story ascribed (p. 54) to Martin Azpilcueta (Navarrus), that there were some who wished to forbid vernacular versions of the Lord's Prayer and the Hail Mary; or the remark of a professor of Salamanca against the Bible of Antwerp (p. 52); or certain misunderstood lines of Melchior Cano (p. 53). By the aid of a few anecdotes of the kind, a future historian may prove to our posterity that the citizens of the United States of America, towards the close of the 19th century, were a nation of most uncivilized barbarians.

While treating of this matter, we wish to enter an emphatic protest against the system of those historians who relate in their text as fact what they feel obliged in a subjoined note to correct as untrue. Of this Mr. Lea is guilty, on page 52, where, on the authority of the unreliable Llorente, he states that in 1559 a decree of the Inquisition forced the professors of theology to give up all their Hebrew and Greek Bibles. In the foot-note (4) he is forced to confess that, "there is probably some mistake in this assertion." And he proves it then and there. Well, if Llorente's assertion was probably not true, for what purpose was it put into the text, if not to prejudice the reader? Certainly not in order to show that his "authority" cannot be trusted. Besides, Mr. Lea has either not used the whole passage in Llorente, or not understood what he read. Only two paragraphs ahead, Llorente states that by the order of the Inquisition, Bibles marked as suspect (that is suspected of containing heretical error) should be examined; that only those books could be seized which were placed on the list (evidently an Index). The above order to professors of theology is followed immediately in the same paragraph by the provision that "those who possess Hebrew, Greek or Arabic books *different from those on the catalogue* (again the list or index of forbidden books) will not be molested." Thus Mr. Lea's awful order of the Inquisition by which—as he wishes us to believe—even professors of theology were not allowed to have a Hebrew or Greek Bible, dwindles down to the then quite reasonable provision that they should not keep Hebrew or Greek Bibles corrupted by Jews or heretics; and that such editions as were placed on the Index as suspected, should be handed over for examination. Nor was this such an immense task as our author perhaps imagines; for the book market of that time was most probably not overstocked with Hebrew or Greek copies

published by some American or English Bible Society—although Llorente is absolutely silent on this point.

13. Mr. Lea seems really very slightly acquainted with the ideas and acts of the Church with regard to the reading and understanding of the sacred books. Not only has she always encouraged learned men who have striven to give their countrymen good translations of the Bible, but she wishes that in every church where it is possible the Holy Scriptures should be publicly explained and interpreted. The Council of Trent, sess. V., c. 1., De reform. provides that "In ecclesiis . . . in quibus . . . stipendium pro lectoribus sacræ theologiæ deputatum reperitur. . . . Episcopi eos qui stipendium hujusmodi obtinent ad ipsius Sacræ Scripturæ expositionem et interpretationem, per seipsos, si idonei fuerint, alioquin per idoneum substitutum ab ipsis episcopis eligendum, compellant." She wishes also that bishops and parish priests should frequently explain the scriptures and the law of God to their flocks: (Trent. sess. xxiv, c. 4. De reform.) "Saltem omnibus dominicis et solemnibus diebus festis, tempore autem jejuniorum quadragesimæ et adventus Domini quotidie vel saltem tribus in hebdomada diebus, si ita oportere duxerint, sacras Scripturas divinamque legem annuntient [Episcopi et Parochis], et alias, quotiescunque id opportune fieri posse judicaverint." Certainly, these decrees have not remained a dead letter. There exists among all Catholic peoples and especially in Italy, under the very eyes of the Inquisition and the Holy See, a whole literature of continuous commentaries on Holy Writ for the use of the faithful, *e.g.*, the works of Cattaneo, Rossi, Cesari, Finetti, and many others, who are celebrated for this style of writing.

The foregoing inquiries can lead to only one conclusion, namely, that, of all the statements and arguments set forth by Mr. Lea concerning the use of the holy Scriptures in the Catholic Church, there is not one that will bear the test of criticism; not one of which we could simply say, it is quite correct. At the same time it cannot escape the critical inquirer, that Mr. Lea has so skilfully interwoven his statements, that the reader being unaware of a continuous *suppressio veri*, will never even guess the truth. We do not dare to say that such was the author's intention; we simply state the fact.

#### THE ROMAN AND SPANISH INDEXES.

In all his essays, Mr. Lea shows what interest he takes in these Indexes by quoting them, we might say, on almost every page, but seldom does he do so correctly. We cannot point out all such mistakes; they are too many, both as to facts and as to the

conclusions he draws. We feel, however, that we ought to call attention to a few, taken at random, *e.g.*, p. 96.

But here we must first make this observation: We have already seen that the learned author puts the first instance of the condemnation or censure of books in the Apostolical Constitution. He mentions also the edicts of Constantine and Justinian against books written by heretics. We are surprised that the famous decree of Pope Gelasius escaped his notice, and still more that in his examination he did not look beyond the Apostolical Constitutions. Surely it cannot be that he is ignorant of the fact that in the Acts of the Apostles, c. xix., 19, mention is made of a circumstance which has, at all times, greatly influenced the judgment and conduct of Christians in this matter. Mr. Lea might also have reminded his readers of Plato's opinion about the writings of those poets who speak ill of the gods; also of the judgment of the famous jurists, Paulus and Ulpian, on books *improbatae lectionis*, not to mention many instances of intolerance on the part of the Athenians and Romans, which are recorded by Diogenes Laertius, Plutarch, Titus Livius, Cicero and others. Nor would it have been amiss had he devoted a few pages to the philosophic reasons for such censorship of books, were it only to refute them. Lastly, why did he not compare, at various epochs, Spanish legislation with that of other contemporary nations? Such comparisons throw light on the subject, and help the reader to form a just or at least a more impartial judgment. For instance, in the seventeenth century the learned councillor of the Elector of Brandenburg, Samuel Stryk (1701), cheerfully acknowledges the right of a prince to preserve his people from heretical and hurtful writings: "Quantum ad nos, concedimus libentissime, principum esse atque magistratum providere ne quid libris damnatis et haereticis detrimenti capiat respublica. . . . Si qui tamen improbatae lectionis libri fuerint, illos non publice quidem divendere licebit," etc. ("Opera," b. viii., disp. ii., c. 1, n. 36.) We could cite many other Protestant authorities who defend the same.

The very first lines of the chapter entitled "Independence of Rome" furnish a most remarkable specimen of Mr. Lea's knowledge of Catholic subjects. He writes: "If any definition of faith or morals by the Vicar of Christ was entitled to unquestioning obedience by all the faithful, it would seem that embodied in the decision as to whether a book is orthodox and fitted for perusal; and yet, outside of a portion of Italy, the papal decrees on the subject received scant obedience, and, least of all, we may say in Spain, the most orthodox of lands." In what theologian has Mr. Lea read that the condemnation of a book implies a *definition* of faith? No one has ever taught such an absurdity. Every Catholic



knows the difference between a *doctrinal* and a *disciplinary* decree. If Mr. Lea wishes to speak on such topics, he ought at least to study beforehand some of our Catechisms.

But let us see how Mr. Lea, the well-informed historian, proves the fact that the most Catholic among all nations made light of the "definitions" implied in the proscription of books, or to speak more accurately, of the disciplinary decrees of the Index. "When, in 1559, Paul IV. issued the first Roman Index, Benito Arias Montano informs us that it excited the indignation of all scholars; that in France and in greater part of Italy it was not obeyed, and that in Spain it was not even suffered to be published." "Villanova, de la Leccion de la Sagrada Escritura," p. 29. Now for the truth:

a. The first Roman Index was composed in 1557, and was published, not in 1559, as Mr. Lea asserts, but in 1558, under the title: "Index Auctorum et Librorum qui tanquam hæretici aut suspecti aut perniciosi ab Officio S. Romæ Inquisitionis reprobantur et in universa Christiana republica interdicuntur." A second edition was prepared soon after, and published in 1559, shortly before the death of Paul IV. It bears the title: "Index auctorum et librorum, qui ab Officio Sanctæ Romanæ et universalis Inquisitionis caveri ab omnibus et singulis in universa Christiana republica, sub censuris contra legentes vel tenentes libros prohibitos in bulla quæ lecta est in coena Domini expressis, et sub aliis poenis in decreto ejusdem Sacri Officii contentis."

b. It is true that the Index of Paul IV. was received with but little favor, not so much on account of the method followed in it, but because of its too great severity with regard to certain works, and particularly because the punishments therein decreed were excessive and imprudent. To establish this fact, however, it was not necessary to unearth the testimony of Benedict Arias Montano, whom Mr. Lea quotes after Villanova, without relating, however, at what time and under what circumstances Montano made his statement. This, we say, was quite unnecessary, as we have a testimony far more authentic and more nearly contemporaneous with the events mentioned, namely, that of "the Fathers of the Council of Trent in the year 1562, and that of Foreiro in the "Præfatio in Indicem librorum prohibitorum."

c. It is true that the Index of Paul IV. did not have a large circulation, partly because its author died so soon after its appearance and partly because the idea of correcting it came almost immediately. It is false, however, to assert that it was not received anywhere. As a matter of fact, as we shall see presently, Spain did receive it.

Mr. Lea continues: "Valdes, the Inquisitor General, contented

himself with announcing that catalogues of prohibited books had been issued in Rome, Louvain and Portugal, and that the Inquisition would combine them and promulgate a new one. The promised Index speedily appeared and showed that it was framed, with little respect for papal decision. Books prohibited in Rome were permitted in Spain." Why this proves the very contrary to what Mr. Lea asserts. In fact, so truly did Valdes accept the Index of Paul IV., that, combining it with those of Louvain and Portugal, he made it the basis of his own. Mr. Lea himself, whose misfortune it is frequently to unwittingly contradict himself, acknowledges the fact on the very next page, 97, note 3: "That of Valdes, in 1559, had been based on papal authority!" But did Valdes have any right to include the Index of the Pope with those of Louvain and Portugal? Undoubtedly; for, at that time particular Indexes were not prohibited, provided that due regard was paid to the Index of the Sovereign Pontiff. But Mr. Lea will rejoin: Valdes did not show any deference for the Index of Paul IV., for he left out of his own Index, books placed in the Index of the Pope. In proof of this he cites, in the note, Sixtus Birch (Xistus Betulejus, not Bethulius, as Mr. Lea has the name), all of whose books are said to have been condemned by Paul IV., while only one appears on the Valdes Index. We have had no chance to investigate this fact. But, whatever it may be, in matters like this, a single exception would prove nothing. Besides, we have every reason to doubt the accuracy of Mr. Lea's statements. Thus, in that same note 3 of page 97, where he speaks of Betulejus, he writes: "As for the Adagia, Valdes only permits that work in the expurgated Aldine edition (Reusch, *die Indices*, p. 259), which is more liberal than Paul IV., who forbade all the works of Erasmus (ib., p. 183), but this was relaxed in the Tridentine Index of 1564, which permitted the Aldine Adagia (ib., p. 259)." Who would not understand this to mean that by the Index of Pius IV., published after the Council of Trent, all the works of Erasmus were forbidden, with the exception of the Aldine edition of the Adagia. Judge for yourself. We give the very words of the Index of Pius IV.: "Desiderii Erasmi Roterdami, Colloquiorum liber, Moria, Lingua, Christiani Matrimonii Institutio, De interdicto esu carniū, Ejusdem paraphrasis in Matthæum *quæ a Bernardino Eremitæ in italicam linguam conversa est*. Cætera verò opera ipsius, *in quibus de religione tractat*, tamdiu prohibita sint, quamdiu a facultate theologica Parisiensi vel Lovaniensi expurgata non fuerint. Adagia verò ex editione quam molitur Paulus Manutius permittentur. Interim verò quæ jam edita sunt, expunctis locis suspectis, judicio alicujus facultatis theologicæ uni-

versitatis catholicæ, vel inquisitionis alicujus generalis permittantur.

Mr. Lea continues: "After the death of Paul there was less rigidity in Rome, and then Valdes refused to respond to this liberality. The Roman Inquisitor General, Michele Ghisleris (afterwards St. Pius V.) sent to Spain an edict announcing the striking off from the Index of certain books by order of Pius IV., and permitting the reading of works free from heresy—works of medicine, science, grammar and other indifferent matters, prohibited only because written by heretics; also anonymous books and vernacular Bibles. Valdes, however, suspended the publication of this decree, and remonstrated with Philip II. against permitting currency to this papal liberality." And Mr. Lea cites Llorente i., 421. Once more, what is the truth? The Index of Paul IV., as we have already acknowledged, was generally considered too strict. Hence, the Inquisitor General, by order of Pius IV., published in 1561, a *Monitum*, entitled, "*Moderatio Indicis librorum prohibitorum*." By that *Monitum* permission was given: "Ut tollerentur ex Indice, I. libri qui nulla alia ratione prohibiti sunt, nisi quia ab impresoribus suspectis emanarunt; II. versiones catholicorum doctorum tollerentur factæ ab hæreticis, dummodo tollerentur hæreses; III. libri Catholicorum non alia ratione prohibiti nisi quia præfationes, summulas et Scholia habent hæreticorum, purgati tolerentur." If Valdes suspended the publication of this decree, it was not that he denied its authority, but for the reasons which Llorente thus explains: "The Inquisitor General Valdes wrote to the provincial inquisitors to suspend the publication of the edict until he should have received orders from the king, whom he had consulted and to whom he had shown how dangerous a measure it might be, which, by removing the Pope's excommunication, favored the criminals whom ancient bulls did excommunicate. But there was yet another motive of Valdes' policy. This inquisitor had, on the 27th August, 1559, published a printed list (catalogue) of forbidden books which was more extensive than that of 1558, and in which he had entered all the books that had been placed in the catalogue of Rome, Lisbon, Louvain and older ones of Spain. Those who possessed and read any of those books were to be excommunicated and to pay a fine of 200 ducats. Now, among the number of these books were many, the reading of which was allowed by the last papal edict." If we may believe this statement of Llorente, which we have not been able to verify, it plainly follows that the ordinances of the Pope were considered obligatory in Spain, and that they were also executed; while the milder edict of Pius IV. created no little difficulty, seeing that it annulled measures which had been so recently enacted, and that



consequently its force was suspended until the king should have given further orders.

Let us continue: "When, in 1562, the reassembled Council of Trent took up the whole subject to make laws binding on all Christendom, Philip II. wrote earnestly to the Count de Luna, his ambassador, to prevent the Tridentine Commission from attempting to include Spain in its regulations. Spain, he urged, had her own Index and her own laws of censorship; no rules could be universal, for a book might be innocent in one place and dangerous in another. He obtained no formal exemption of his dominions from Tridentine rules; but this made no difference, and Spain continued to act with the utmost independence." Thus runs Mr. Lea's story. Here is what historical documents tell us:

*a.* When at the Council of Trent in the beginning of 1562, the Fathers treated of the Index, the Spanish bishops, although great patriots and very jealous of the prerogative of their king and nation, offered no objection at all. The Archbishop of Granada simply remarked that to compose an Index would be too long and great a labor to be done by the Fathers of the Council; and the Archbishop of Braga added that the work should be confided to the universities of Bologna, Paris, Salamanca, and Coimbria. See Pallavicini, "*Storia del Concilio di Trento*," l. xv., c. 19. King Philip, says Pallavicini, wrote with much moderation, requesting only that the Index made by the Spanish Inquisition should not be changed so far as his dominions were concerned. This request proved beyond doubt that the king considered himself bound by the general laws of the Church.

*b.* Philip demanded neither a formal exemption from the law nor different rules of the Index; all that he requested was that the Spanish Index, based on that of Paul IV., might not be changed. Whether, in deference to his explanations, this was done or not, it is a fact that when the Tridentine Index was published by Pius IV. Philip proved himself a true Catholic king and received it with due submission. By his edict of February 5, 1569, he ordered the Roman Index to be fully observed in all his dominions (as even Van Espen acknowledges, "*Ins. Eccl.*," lib. xxii., c. 5, n. 6); nay, he gave orders to have it printed; for the Index which the Duke of Alba, by the will of the king, had printed by Plantinus in 1569 and 1570 is precisely the Index of Pius IV.

According to Mr. Lea, p. 98, "The Tridentine rules and Index, in fact, were not adopted by the Council, but in the hurry of the final session were referred to the Pope, under whose authority they were revised and published." In this assertion there is some truth. The whole truth is as follows:

The Council of Trent, after resuming its meetings under Pius IV.,

meant to deal with pernicious books. The Fathers thought it very important, for the preservation of faith and morals, to publish an Index by which dangerous books issued since the origin of Protestantism should be forbidden to the public. They wished to enforce this law rigorously among all Catholics. Then, too, the Council deemed it expedient to examine, together with the books published since the rise of heresy, the censures which had been passed on them in different places. The Council undertook further the examination of the censures contained in the Index of Paul IV. The Fathers were left free to adopt any means they might think most simple and most expeditious to carry out the examination of both the books and the censures. They agreed unanimously upon a committee, which should be entrusted with this duty. The members of this committee were to be appointed by the cardinal-legates. All this was done before the session of February 26, 1562, was held.

The committee was occupied with their work for eighteen months. They asked for the help of theologians from the different Catholic nations, that thus they might examine with more accuracy both books and censures. As a final result the committee wrote out general rules; they revised Paul IV.'s catalogue, which they admitted, *paucis demptis paucis additis*, as, Foreiro says: "they noted the books which might be allowed to be read when corrected."

Before the close of the Council of Trent the committee on the Index had given the finishing touch to its work, as we are informed by the very words of the Council: "Cont. sess. 24, die 4 Dec. Audiens S. Synodus huic operi (Indicis) ab eis (delectis lectis Patribus) extremam manum impositam esse, nec tamen ob librorum varietatem et multitudinem distincte et commode possit a Sancta Synodo dijudicari, præcipit, ut, quidquid ab illis præscriptum est, Sanctissimo Romano Pontifici exhibeatur, ut ejus judicio atque auctoritate terminetur et evulgetur."

So the Council requires that the work done by the committee should be reported to the Pope to be approved by him and promulgated by his authority. Now the bull of promulgation, *Dominici gregis*, reads as follows: "Peracto concilio, cum ex ipso synodi decreto, is Index nobis oblatus fuisset, nos doctissimis quibusdam probatissimisque prælatis eum accuratissime legendum examinandumque commisimus, et ipsi etiam legimus. Cum igitur eum magno studio, acri judicio, diuturna cura confectum, et præterea commodissime digestum esse cognoverimus, nos . . . ipsum Indicem una cum regulis ei propositis, auctoritate Apostolica approbamus."

We must conclude from all this that the Index is not only a Pontifical work, but also the work of the Council. It was not hard to

find these particulars ; we had only to consult the acts and decrees of the Council, the bull of Pius IV., and the preface which Foreiro wrote for the first edition of the Tridentine Index.

If Mr. Lea has an imperfect knowledge of the way the Index was composed he has no better knowledge of the editions of it. If, before setting pen to paper, he had made some researches on this subject he would have ascertained that, in the period he is dealing with, there were four chief editions of the Index, *i.e.*, the editions of Pius IV., Clement VIII., Alexander VII., and Benedict XIV. (see Benedict XIV., *Quæ ad catholicæ religionis*). He would have learned that it is superfluous to accumulate and quote indiscriminately (p. 34, 104 and *passim*) true editions and their reprints; that it is superfluous also to quote the supplements which are wont to be published between two editions, as those supplements contain nothing that may not be found in the subsequent editions; and that it is still more superfluous, not to say unscientific, to quote private together with official editions. To quote thus is what may well be styled throwing dust into the eyes of ignorant people, besides exposing oneself to the danger of inaccuracy; and this has happened more than once in the work of Mr. Lea, which we are reviewing. Thus (p. 104, n. 2) Mr. Lea, to prove that the book of Poza was condemned in 1628, refers us to the " Librorum post Indicem Clementis VIII. (prohibitorum) decreta, Romæ, 1624!" A line of explanation was necessary, for an attentive reader will ask how a catalogue published in 1624 can possibly mention a book condemned in 1628. With his ordinary recklessness he quotes the Elenchus of Capiferreo in one place, *i.e.*, p. 34: " Elenchus librorum omnium;" in another, *i.e.*, p. 104, " Elenchus libb. prohibb." As for Erasmus, he refers us, p. 24, to the Index of Clement VIII., Romæ, 1596, pp. 43, 44, 46; but, in those pages we have found no mention whatsoever of this writer; the only page where Erasmus is named is 28. Again, p. 34, Mr. Lea quotes the Index of Sixtus V., but he does not inform the reader that this Index was not published officially; for Clement VIII. says in the bull *Sacrosanctum*: "Sixtus Papa quintus prædecessor noster, multis illustratis atque ad regulas adjectis necessariis rebus, mandavit ut nonnulli alii ejusdem generis libri, eidem Indici adderentur. Verum cum idem Sixtus, re minime absoluta, ab humanis excesserit; Nos . . . quod jam pridem utiliter captum, et a multis diu desideratum erat, hoc tempore omnino perficiendum atque in lucem edendum duximus."

Is Mr. Lea more fortunate in the interpretation he gives of the Index? Alas, no! And the proof you will find further on, for instance, in a note, p. 66: "The Tridentine rules (Regula II.) allow the use of books written by heretics on other subjects than religion,



after examination and approbation by bishops and inquisitors. In the Roman Indexes, however, the first class consisted of the simple names of authors, all of whose works, without exception, were prohibited." We should like, first of all, to know why the author brings in this distinction between the *Tridentine* rules and the *Roman* Index; the rules and the catalogue being equally Tridentine or Roman, as we have seen. Moreover, we will observe that it is not true that the Tridentine rules grant permission, in a general way, to read books written by heretics which do not treat of religious matters. The second rule makes a distinction between the *heresiarchs* and ordinary heretics. All books written by heresiarchs, whatever the subject-matter, are prohibited. Books written by ordinary heretics are equally prohibited when they treat professionally (*ex professo*) of religious matters; otherwise they may be read, provided, however, they have received ecclesiastical approval. Neither is it true, as repeatedly asserted by Mr. Lea, that all the books of authors named in the first class of the Index are prohibited, nor is it true, consequently, that there is a contradiction between the second rule which permits certain books, written by heretics, to be read and the general prohibition of the first class. Both the rules of the Index and the division of the catalogue into three classes were drawn up by the same authors; and it is hard to believe that so distinguished a body would have contradicted itself. The fact is that Mr. Lea does not understand the question at all. The Index of Pius IV., like the present one, was arranged in alphabetical order; but the matter under each letter was divided into three classes, which division was maintained up to the time of Alexander VII. The first class contained not the titles of books, but the names of authors, heretics, or persons suspected of heresy. In the second class were indicated books written by Catholic authors, but of dangerous tendency. The third and last class contained the titles of anonymous books whose doctrines were pernicious; these are the three classes of the Index catalogue which we find so frequently mentioned from the time of Pius IV. It is easily seen that the second rule agrees with the division into three classes. The authors contained in the first class are heresiarchs, all of whose books are prohibited; or the books of ordinary heretics; the works of the latter (which the Index does not enumerate) are prohibited *ipso facto*, if they treat of religion *ex professo*; if they do not treat of religion they may be read, provided they have ecclesiastical approval.

Mr. Lea frequently quotes the so-called *Expurgatory Indexes*, and in connection with them he tries, pp. 77-79, to show that the methods of the Roman Congregations (Index and Holy Offices) are opposed to those of the Spanish Inquisition, to the advantage

of the latter, as more liberal and just. Here again Mr. Lea is wrong. The Spanish Inquisitory Indexes are conformable with the Roman Index. In fact, according to the rules of the Roman Index, there are books which cannot be read as long as they have not been corrected; when corrected they are, or at least, may be, allowed to be read. Thus runs the third rule: "Si quæ vero annotationes cum hujusmodi quæ permittuntur versionibus vel cum vulgata versione circumferuntur, expunctis locis suspectis a facultate theologica alicujus universitatis Catholicæ aut inquisitione generali, permitti eis poterunt quibus et versiones." Again, so runs the fifth rule: "Libri illi qui hæreticorum auctorum opera interdum prodeunt, in quibus nulla aut pauca de suo apponunt, sed aliorum dicta colligunt . . . si quæ habeant admixta quæ expurgatione indigeant, illis Episcopi et Inquisitoris una cum theologorum Catholicorum consilio sublatis ac emendatis, permittantur." So again the sixth rule: "Quod si hactenus in aliquo regno vel provincia aliqui libri sint prohibiti quod nonnulla contineant quæ sine delectu ab omnibus legi non expediat, si eorum auctores Catholici sunt, postquam emendati fuerint, permitti ab Episcopo et Inquisitore poterunt." So finally the eighth rule: "Libri quorum principale argumentum bonum est, in quibus tamen obiter aliqua inserta sunt quæ ad hæresim seu impietatem, divinationem seu superstitionem spectant, a Catholicis theologis, Inquisitionis Generalis auctoritate expurgati, concedi poterunt. Idem judicium sit de prologis, summiis seu annotationibus quæ a damnatis auctoribus libris non damnatis appositæ sunt. Sed post hac non nisi emendati excudantur." Whence we conclude that the Tridentine rules of the Index suppose other Indexes to exist (quod si hactenus in aliquo regno vel provincia aliqui libri sunt prohibiti, etc.); they admit, also, that books written by heretics may be corrected; they leave the care of such correction to Catholic faculties of theology, the Inquisition, etc. In consequence of these dispositions several books that had been prohibited were corrected and, in different places, especially in Spain, catalogues of expurgated books were published.

We can show that, both theoretically and practically, the fundamental principle of the Spanish Index was to keep in perfect harmony with the rules of the Roman Index. The Index expurgatorius of Cardinal Quiroga may be usefully consulted on this question. However, with regard to this valuable book, we may remark that Mr. Lea quotes frequently, *i.e.*, p. 82, n. 1, the edition of Saumur, without telling the reader that this edition, published by Calvinists, is preceded by a preface injurious to the Holy See, which, however, must not be imputed to the great Spanish Cardinal.

The Spanish Inquisition had received from the Sovereign Pontiff authority to examine and censure books. It enforced the decrees of the Roman Congregation; it was authorized to add to its own catalogue books which had not yet been inscribed in the Roman, and which it considered pernicious. We find an instance of the exercise of this power in the famous decree of the 10th June, 1683, by which the Spanish Inquisitors prohibited books already condemned by the S. Cong. of the Index, and others which had never been censured. Now we readily acknowledge that the Spanish Inquisitors, for reasons which we need not examine, sometimes exceeded the limits of their authority. For instance, they had no right to condemn books on account of opinions tolerated in the Church or doctrines which were freely discussed among Catholics. They forgot this essential principle when they passed censure on many of the volumes of the "*Acta Sanctorum*" (1595); they forgot it also when, in the *Expurgatory* published in 1747, they inscribed among prohibited books the "*History of Pelagianism*" and the "*Dissertation on the Fifth General Council*," of the celebrated Cardinal Noris. We have not the time nor the wish to discuss these details with Mr. Lea. We would have to point out too many blunders. For instance, in the foot-note 2, of p. 75, he speaks of the absurd claim of the Carmelites to have been founded by *Enoch*! He must mean the prophet *Elias*. He mentions a certain *Papenbroek*; the celebrated Bollandist, *Papebroch*. Again, he quotes *Theodore* of Alexandria, instead of *Theophilus*, we think! And so on.

To prove that the decrees of the Index had no force in Spain, that they were admitted or rejected at the whim of the king, Mr. Lea alleges, pp. 98-99, the measures ordered by the *Pase* and the *Recurso di fuerza*. He should have noticed, but does not, that these measures, at least under the kings of the house of Austria, were never enforced against papal acts dealing with doctrine, liturgy, clerical discipline, or sacramental penance. They were enforced only against acts concerning benefices, the collection of ecclesiastical taxes, the trial of certain causes, and then only when there was a probability of infraction of royal prerogatives or of the rights of a third party. He should have noticed, also, that while enforcing these measures, the Spanish rulers, far from pretending to independence, based their right on the privileges conferred on them by the Popes. Finally, he should have noticed that these measures were not regarded as definitive but as suspensive to the effect of giving the opportunity of enlightening the Pope and of asking him to change his decrees. Will Mr. Lea please read the two principal Spanish canonists who have defended those measures, *Cavarruvias Pract. Quæst* and *Salgado, de Suppli-*



*catione ad Sanctissimum?* He will see that their pretensions do not go beyond the limits we have named. As to Salgado in particular, whose name is often found in the pages of Mr. Lea, we desire, in conclusion, to oppose his authority to that of Mr. Lea. Mr. Lea asserts that no nation was less docile to the decrees of the Holy See condemning books contrary to faith and morals. Now here is what Salgado says (*Op. cit.*, p. 1, c. 3, n. 5): "Inter omnes totius orbis Christianas nationes, nulla excellentior hispanica in *obsequio præstando Sedi Apostolicæ*, in ejus auctoritate tuenda, in *reverentia et obedientia pontificum decretis* propter fidei puritatem et ardentem Catholicæ religionis zelum et cultum, quo semper Hispanorum reges, eorum ministri efflagrasse noscuntur."

Here we rest our case. Volumes would be needed to point out and refute all the falsehoods, mistakes, follies, contradictions contained in the five hundred and six pages of Mr. Lea. We think we have said enough for the purpose we had in view, which was to show the critical and scientific value of Mr. Lea's work, and the amount of confidence his lucubrations in Church history deserve.

---

## THE ÆSTHETIC IN EDUCATION.

IT is one of the curious results of a certain flurry over "sun-flowers and lilies," a few years ago, that the very word "æsthetic" has fallen under the ban. With a large number of the community, æsthetic means sentimental, and to introduce such an element into a scholastic course would stamp it as ridiculous. Our title, therefore, must be rescued from the enemy before it can be a proper heading for any educational article.

Beauty—essential beauty—belongs only to God. From this essential beauty of the Divine nature have emanated all those forms, colors, combinations of light and shadow, which captivate the eye, entrance the imagination. Earth, air, the very caves of ocean bear witness to this essential beauty existing in the mind of the Creator and directing His works. The same may be said of harmony; and the delight in sounds, in the eternal music of the spheres, in the rhythm of poesy, carries us back to the Creator as the essential, uncreated harmony of the universe. We see this expressed in a bas-relief on Giotto's Tower under the title of "universal harmony," and Aristoxenes, a disciple of Plato, regarded the soul as a vibration of the uncreated harmony, which Plato himself says: "Those who can apprehend the eternal and immutable are philosophers, and those may truly be called artists who fix their eyes on a perpetual standard of beauty before attempting to elucidate its theory."

There can be, therefore, no fashion, either in beauty or in harmony, nor will there be found any in the works of the great masters, whether of sculpture, painting, music or poesy—arts in which the æsthetic has found a refuge from the beginning. This is why a fragment of Greek sculpture may become the germ of a school like that which grew up around Niccolo Pisano, and still makes the study from the antique considered a necessary training for genius. This, too, is why the chords of Hebrew psalmody and of the Greek chorus weave themselves into the compositions of Bach and of Palestrina. The essential beauty and harmony can never die. It is the turning away from them which brings decline into the arts, but they never become extinct; and suddenly the old harmonies and the ancient laws of beauty come to some soul like a lost dowry, and we remember that beauty and harmony are eternal. It is in this sense of the word that æsthetics can and even must enter into every enlightened plan of education, although depending, happily, less upon text-books than upon surroundings.

We all know what orators are produced by elocutionists, what poets by grammarians, what painters and sculptors by an academy, even while we insist upon this aid.

"Plant and flower of light"

is a line which no lily in a florist's window could have inspired, as no caged songster could have inspired "The Meadow Lark." We know this. But let us go back to our Greeks and see how they practiced what we know.

First of all, Homer as the exponent of Greek genius. Here is a boy living three hundred years after the Trojan war who is heir to all popular traditions and ballads, who sees, not as one in the conflict, but through the transfiguring atmosphere of time, of distance. Yet this is not all. Born under the skies of Ionia on the shores of the Ægean sea, his baby eyes open not only upon a far horizon, blue skies and olive groves, but dilate to take in all the grandeur of processions in honor of the gods, and the hymns chanted in full chorus fill his infant ears. Year after year come processions, not mere civic shows to entertain the people, but religious processions, into which fall every rank of society, and in which all hearts find themselves uplifted, which the beauty of the costumes, the harmony of the chorus, the very multitudes, animated as they are with one heart and voice, kindle the venerating imagination of youth. Thus the songs of the bards, chants, as they are, in honor of the beloved traditions of his nation, and the recitation in which the actor is the poet as well, like our own Shakespeare. The first buddings of intelligent curiosity are stimulated by the delights of travel, and Phœnicia, Asia, Africa, with her "hundred-gated Thebes," her pyramids, nourish that lofty mood into which reverence enters to exalt all forms of loveliness. And when he returns and the familiar ballads of Troy, of gods, goddesses and heroes are again in his ears, they suggest grander possibilities than he had before dreamed of, until, all at once, they are fused in the glowing alembic of his imagination into one magnificent epic, which the world will cherish as long as the world exists. Such was the public school in which Greece educated her youths nine hundred years before Christ.

Let us now take the lyrist, Pindar himself, the master and leader of that train of poets, touching with tender, heroic or reverent hand the lyre of song.

Born in the neighborhood of Thebes in Bœotia, 522 or 518 B.C., he was not only descended from Cadmus, but his family had been distinguished for generations, poetically and musically, at the great festivals, a distinction among the Greeks which brought



signal and lasting honors. But although, by birth, a child of song, no inherited gifts were supposed to supersede the necessity for assiduous culture in everything pertaining to the lyric art. Like Homer, his surroundings fostered poetic inspirations not only through the loveliness of nature, but the charms of the legend, the grandeur of historic narrative, above all, the religious rites and ceremonies, while the Olympic wreath swam before his boyish imagination as no civic honors could have done. Our Pindar belonged to a people to whom song and all the delights of the imagination were a daily necessity, not an occasional luxury. The atmosphere was vitalized by the chant of the bard and the chorus of the procession. What, then, was more worthy of labor to acquire than the secrets of harmonious song? As an infant his ear was familiar with the rhythm of musical utterances, poetic sentences, and as a boy the rules of composition, the harmonies of metre and their possibilities were treated as a science. To this was added orchestric dancing, the poetry of motion, an art in itself among this imaginative people, and also the mysterious harmonies of instrumental and vocal music. He was thus furnished not only with themes from tradition, history and religion, but with a language of universal import through which to express the most sublime conceptions, the most heroic sentiments, the most ærial fancies. Nor was he left to the influences of his own family or his own city. Athens was to develop all these resources and stimulate all these subtle motives which belong to the poetic organism. Instructors, like Lasus, would guide his muse, perfect his sentences, while such mistresses of the lyric art as his countrywomen Myrtis and Corinne watched over the efflorescence of a genius that was to become a competitor with them, before the eyes of all Greece, for that laurel wreath more desired than the bay of the conqueror.

We cannot leave these competitions without a word as to their influence. By the way in which people often refer now-a-days to these Olympic games, one might suppose some restoration of this spirit had appeared among us. We may not have our chariot and foot races, or our wrestlers, but have we not our college regattas! contests so absorbing as to put class poems out of mind? We seem to forget that the laurel crown not only gave distinction to the poet, but secured to successful competitors of all sorts a reward which made purses of gold and silver cups absolutely valueless. It was the Ode, chanted while the procession bore the victor through the gates of his city, wearing "the garland of wild olive, cut from the sacred tree in the grove of Altis, near the altars of Aphrodite and the Horæ," as his only prize, which stamped this honor with the choice characteristics of Greek civilization.

No sooner was a victory won, than every poet grasped his pen,

as every warrior had grasped his sword for the combat; and to live in the odes of Greece was indeed fame. The two verses by Simonides, inscribed on the monument to the three hundred who fell at Thermopylæ, "all Greece, for centuries, had by heart. She forgot them, and Greece was living Greece no more." It was this demand upon our poet for the most august as well as the most festive occasions, which made poesy, not the passing fancy of youth, not the mere blossom of his springtime, but the serious occupation of an entire life; and so far from diverting his mind from the observance of the pious usages of his times, hymns to the gods allowed him to express the venerating sentiments of a nature as devout as it was poetic. Pindar chanted his own hymns with an enthusiasm which was echoed by all Greece.

It is a common saying to-day: "Poets cannot be grown." What was it that all at once blighted Ravenna's Forest of Pines? Showing that these giants, the growth of centuries, were dependent upon hidden springs, and were the exponents of influences and surroundings which could be destroyed, even if they could not be created by one generation.<sup>1</sup>

Passing from the classic ages of Greece, and even of Rome, as under similar æsthetic influences, we come to those Christian ages which Ozanam has so carefully analyzed, touching with his divinizing-rod of exquisite sympathy the primal chords of that poesy which was crowned in Dante and his *Divina Commedia*. Instead, however, of regarding this as a solitary monument of those ages, he tells us: "In the thirteenth century poesy had not taken refuge in the heart of a single citizen of Florence; it was everywhere. In the actions of the times which saw the last crusades, the fall of Frederic II., the vocation of St. Louis, the apostolate of Saint Francis and of St. Dominic, when God, having sown on His part, great events, expected them to spring forth in great thoughts. It was in the monuments of a period which built the Holy Chapel, founded the cathedrals of Cologne and of Florence, inspired Eudes de Montreuil, Niccolo Pisano, and Cimabue."<sup>2</sup> And then he takes us back to that charming little paper-covered favorite, to be found in every bookstall of Italy, "Fioretti di San Francesco," the Little Flowers, grown in the sunshine of that dear St. Francis who preached to the birds, and whose life of utter poverty had such a charm for the children of opulence; by whose "Cantic to Holy Poverty," to his "Brother the Sun," chanted to the airs of the people, the voice, and the ear, and the very heart of Italy, were trained in a school which compelled Dante to write, not in the

<sup>1</sup> See *La Pineta Distrutta*, by Dr. William Thomas Parsons.

<sup>2</sup> *Des Sources Poétique de la Divine Comédie*. Ozanam.

stately classic tongue, but in his own Italian; thus educating the centuries, crystallizing his Tuscan speech, and making it, by his own sublime intensity, the language not only of the contadini and the cantatrice but of ecstatic vision; while it was, also, the age of Jacopone di Todi and his immortal *Stabat Mater*. We need not refer to the age of Petrarch and Tasso, as that of song, for all ages have been this in Christian Italy; and, to this day, it is as essential to her festivals, even in the family, as to the Greek in the days of Homer or of Pindar.

There is none of the "familiarity which breeds contempt" in uniting such examples of æsthetics in universal education to those of our own times, only that homeliness, which is one of the marks of genuineness, and which we should see much oftener than we do in the models of poesy were we as familiar with their times as with our own.

Who has not been a favored visitor, at least, in some of those old towns, villages we might say rather, where simplicity without rusticity, marks a phase of æsthetic culture never approached in populous cities; where the very headstones of families bear witness to a poetic vein which needed not to borrow, even from Gray's "Elegy," lines befitting the grave of the flower of village girls, as well as of the patriarch; where, no matter how solemn or joyful the anniversary, the graceful impromptu or the stately ode has never been wanting to crown the occasion? How well we remember Washington's birthday, celebrated in Old Deerfield, when George Bancroft was at the height of his fame, and was the orator of the day. With what awe we watched, from one of the square side pews of the meeting-house, the procession as it entered the middle aisle, and one after another of the dignified personages pointed out to us and named; and when the orator stood up in that high pulpit, not, indeed, of storied marble, but of the choicest mahogany, of proportions a Pisano might have given, with its hangings of silken damask, and its side-lamps of silver, he left a picture on the mind of the child in the square side pew not to be forgotten. But the crowning enthusiasm came to the soul of the child when the choir of fully fifty voices, from *soprano* to *basso*, gave out, accompanied by stringed instruments only, the ode for the day:

"Hail to the day which gave Washington birth;  
Joy to Columbia, hope to the earth."

Written by one whose father, grandfather, great-grandfather had kept alive all the traditions of country, of town, and even of the village, to be transmitted by an ode worthy of the best days of heroic verse, and which, in Greece, would have won the laurel crown for its poet.



A few years after and another of these events was celebrated which give to this ancient town so honorable a celebrity; it was the laying of the corner-stone of the monument which marks the spot where fell, on the 18th of September, 1675, seventy young men, "the flower of the county of Essex." No fairer day ever shone in September, and the purple grapes on the road-side reminded one of the fatal security which lured this choice band to pluck them from the vines hanging so temptingly above them. The swampy ground had been reclaimed for more than a century, and the only trace of it was in a winding brook, among its lush grasses tall stalks of the scarlet cardinal flower, and named "Bloody Brook," from the massacre of that day in 1675. The fair village took this brook into the width of its street, and all around us were the evidences of civilized thrift. But no meeting-house could contain the thousands flocking to this spot. The rostrum was built under two spreading walnut trees, and only their canopy of leaves, touched by the light frosts of September, rose above the orator of the day, who was no other than Edward Everett; and never did that graceful figure stand out before a more inspiring background; the blue sky cleft by the summit of Mount Sugar-loaf, and overhanging the beetling precipices of purple sandstone, King Philip's seat. The wind was lulled in the arms of autumn, and the voice of the poet-orator rang out as clear as a flute over the plain, dark with breathless listeners. Seated on the knees of my mother, I heard and saw everything, and the march of that fated band through the forests on the morning of that other 18th of September became a living reality, until when, with one of his inimitable gestures, the orator exclaimed: "Ha! the red plume of an Indian chieftain!" I closed my eyes with a shudder, full of the terror a child feels for an ambush, only to hear the dulcet voice say, reassuringly: "No, only the red leaf in the changing maple!" What rocky pass, even of Thermopylæ, ever gave more startling imagery than that which came to the New England orator on the grave of these seventy young men, "The flower of the county of Essex," in the shadow of King Philip's seat?

The conditions of the æsthetic never change, whatever may be the changes of scene or of circumstance, and the æsthetics of heroism certainly lie as precious germs in our national history. The celebration of her anniversaries, instead of becoming puerile, given over to the picnics of boys and girls, should be celebrated with ever-increasing splendor. City should vie with city to blazon forth on the evening sky the fiery outlines of great national victories by land and sea, while orator and poet should be called upon for their noblest periods, their most exalted measures.

Behold the education, the public education, which the greatest

Republic the world has ever seen should give to her generations as they rise up by millions within her borders, nor will there fail to be planted the seeds of forests outrivalling those of Ravenna, to be nourished by springs too deep, too copious for man's engineering to cut off. The æsthetic capabilities of our Republic can be developed only by an education which cherishes traditions too inspiring to be forgotten, too sacred to be profaned.

Thus far, with all the accentuation we may be disposed to give to classical antecedent, to patriotic story, we have skirted only the base of our Pisgah, around which circle fair cities, noble governments, centres of science and of art, according to that natural order common to all races, countries, beliefs. But above and beyond this region, delectable as it may seem, within easy reach, too, of human attainment, we discern heights of thought, actual summits of created perfection, towering serenely into an atmosphere which seems no other than Heaven itself, and lending to these summits such spiritualized hues and forms as we associate with a land of vision. Yet these summits belong to that aërial range of æsthetics born of Christian faith, nourished by Christian contemplation and Christian prayer, to which the eagle's wing alone can aspire, under the patronage of St. John, whose gospel opens with the mystical words: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." Here we touch the secret of that supernatural force which has lifted our mountain summits above Assyrian, Roman or even Greek æsthetics, while to follow the upward way at ever so slow a pace we must have as our guide that infallible teacher, the Church of God, on which has been bestowed all the gifts of the Holy Spirit.

One of the characteristics of this "Higher School of Æsthetics," as we may venture to call it, is its universality. While putting to blush the claims of Socrates by eliminating sophistries from the heart as well as from the intellect; while taking in the sciences of the material world and the logic of human reason according to Aristotle, and the science of spiritualities as achieved by Plato, as segments are taken into perfect circles, no grades of preparation are required for admission to its ranks, the tutelage being given through world-wide Sacraments and a world-wide Liturgy.

These world-wide Sacraments are not only seven fountains of sanctification, but the energizing forces which at times assume almost a creative power, as if bringing virtues into existence as well as developing their germs, while the world-wide Liturgy is the lifelong educator of the individual, and from age to age of nations and continents, raising them, whether from the grossness of barbaric ignorance or the degradation of inherited heathen vices to the practice of the most delicate gradations of Christian sen-

timent as well as of Christian morality, and even of that chivalry by which social intercourse is exalted, until period after period has effloresced in ideals of beauty and of harmony which can never die, since, even if destroyed to the sense, they must live forever through the impetus they have given to human thought. Is it, then, rash to declare this Liturgy to have been for these nineteen hundred years the world's educator in Christian æsthetics?

The first stroke of catacomb art, when compared with the antique or pagan, discloses the existence of a new motive, of a new ideal. Compare the virgin huntress Diana, belonging in its type to one, two and three of the noblest periods of Greek art, with a Christian virgin like Saint Pudentiana on the walls of Saint Priscilla's subterranean cemetery. The first is, indeed,

"As chaste as ice, as pure as snow,"

a glittering negation, a scorner of affection, while the last is a positive flame, fed by the love of God, tending toward Him so as to draw with it all human sympathies, all compassionate tendernesses. In the same way compare the strength of the pagan Hercules with the strength of a Saint Christopher, which is not the strength of the body alone, but of a mighty will, intent upon serving God altogether and utterly. Again, compare that most noble, and at the same time that most tender, example of antique pagan maternity Eirene, with the child Plutos, by Kephisodotos, the father of Praxiteles, with a Madonna, we will not say by Raphael, but with that Madonna of the first Christian century on the wall of the same cemetery of Saint Priscilla as mentioned above. It is impossible to mistake one for the other, nor is it possible for the most uncompromising champion of classic art to deny the superiority of the spiritual ideal in such instances over that of physical perfection, the beauty of the soul, of the heart, supernaturally exalted over any merely natural sentiment of maternal affection.

The same motive, so evident in those works of Christian art addressing themselves to the eye, is to be recognized in all the music which can be called religious, but above all in those compositions which embody, we might rather say enshrine, the sacred liturgy. We may take the Preface for Trinity Sunday as the most familiar, set to the Gregorian notes as given in the Missal. In vain shall we seek through the entire world, including Greek chant, for sentences of such sublime musical power as those which enunciate the mystery of the Triune Godhead; the musical phrases with their solemnly emphatic pauses according to the text, like it, having a majesty which soars above all ordinary expressions of



thought. To hear it sung, as we have heard it by the solitary voice of the celebrant, unaccompanied, as it ever should be, by organ or any instrument whatsoever, and that voice one which filled serenely without effort every arch of the cathedral, is to hear what carries the soul truly on eagle's pinions to one of our aerial summits.

But let us take Holy Week as a concrete exponent of the Liturgy as it appeals through the eye and the ear to the highest interior sense of beauty and of harmony. To begin with Palm Sunday and its procession according to the rubric, the palms waving to the chant of the *Gloria, laus, et honor, Tibi sit*. What pictures has it not inspired from Duccio of Siena to Overbeck in our own days, and as we have watched the solemn gladness on the faces of old and young, we have felt certain that not even a Duccio or an Overbeck could give a more exalted expression than that worn by thousands during a procession on Palm Sunday here in the United States. Nor can we forget those three evenings when the Matins and Lauds are sung as the mournful *Tenebrae* and the Lamentations of Jeremiah once more recall that Jerusalem which slew her prophets and rejected those who came to her from on high, as if the nightingale of sacred song had withdrawn herself to thick woods, there in darkness and seclusion to chant the Passion of her Lord. The charm of these Nocturns is too subtle to explain, but they draw crowds who never think of opening a Holy Week book or following one chanted psalm.

Then Holy Thursday and its pontifical ceremonials. The groups in the sanctuary as august as on any frescoed wall of Rome, of Tuscany or Umbria. The chaste beauty of color coming in among the gold and white vestments, the mitred majesty of the celebrant bowed before the unseen Presence on the altar, the blessing of the oils, and that "*Ave Sanctum Chrisma!*" "*Ave Sanctum Oleum!*" breathed over the unctuous ampullæ, the chant of priestly voices as they are carried in procession to the distant sacristy growing fainter and fainter. But the crowning glory of the solemnity is the procession of the Blessed Sacrament. Under the canopy the unmitered prelate bearing the sacred burden, preceded by waving censers and flowers giving forth their odors under his footsteps, the chanted *Pange lingua*, the resplendent Repository where the Lord of the Tabernacle is to repose adored by silent throngs until to-morrow's sorrowful dawn. What is there in scenic representation outside this Liturgy which can for one moment so lift the heart and at the same time so solemnize its pulses? And this to lead by transition which would shock were it not sustained by a ritual which surpasses all mere human invention, to the solemnity of Good Friday! The thronging multitudes

pressing forward to touch their lips to the feet of the Crucified One, while those "Reproaches" which have come down to us in all their heart-breaking pathos without the change of a note from the fifth age of our Christian era reiterate the story of the Passion which has been already chanted, its *Crucifige* piercing the ear and the heart which still keep the memory of the low minor chord in which the Man of Sorrows responds to the cruelty of His blinded creatures,—and all this puts the puny tragedy of the stage as far from us as fiction is removed from a supernatural fact, a difference never to be measured.

The silent pathos of the hours which follow until the solemnity of Holy Saturday is one of the world's acts of fealty to an ideal transcending its own power to produce. It simply yields to its potency. But dull indeed must be the pulses which are not quickened, sluggish the feet which do not hasten to catch the first flash of the Paschal fire in the vestibule, or the first note of the "Lumen Christi," as the procession goes toward the sanctuary. And yet these are all taken in, as into one gush of jubilant song, with the first note by the "Exultet:" *Exultet jam angelica turba cœlorum*, given of a single voice, unaccompanied except by the throbbing hearts of holy souls watching for the first dawn of the Resurrection. The ritual for the Paschal candle, with the placing of the five grains of incense, the lighting of this effulgent column, is one of those transcendent flights of poesy under the influence of religious fervor and devout erudition which will act upon the human imagination, nourish its most hidden and sacred springs so long as the Liturgy itself endures.

The same may be said of the Blessing of the Font, the significance of which has entered into the mosaics of the great decorators of the early ages, as seen in that chapel of the ancient church of St. Praxides in Rome, called, for its splendor, "Orto del Paradiso," down to the mosaics in the apse of St. John Lateran and of St. Mary Major, by Jacopo Turrita, while an evidence is given of the value attached to the significance of the Prophecies read with so much ceremony on Holy Saturday, by seeing their subjects chosen by Raphael for the representations on the ceiling of his immortal Loggia. In fact, innumerable are the instances in which the Liturgy is taken as the guide of the great theological artists like Orcagna, Signorelli, Michael Angelo and Raphael in their choice of subjects. So rich, indeed, is the Liturgy for Holy Week in suggestions, so powerfully have these suggestions acted upon the world of poesy and of art, that we have been ready to say of Easter Sunday, with its magnificence of promises fulfilled, that, like the sun, its wonder is over when once risen.

But while Holy Week is the most complete as well as the most

concrete example of the influence of the Liturgy, we cannot pass over in silence the processions of the Rogation Days, remembering for how many ages they have been the guardians of the agricultural districts of Christendom against all the subtle foes of the husbandman. There are Catholic rural neighborhoods in our northwest in which the pious traditions of the Old World are preserved and practiced with a picturesque simplicity which meets all the conditions of a scattered population. The large farm-wagons, into which a whole family, including the youngest child, can be loaded with provisions for an entire day, are drawn in procession by stalwart horses up and down and across all the boundary lines of sections, while the Litany of the Saints, of the Blessed Virgin, are sung as they proceed, until every farmer has the satisfaction of knowing that, during these three days, upon his acres, whether few or many, have been invoked all the guardians of the fold and the field; and we can believe how fervently the Feast of the Ascension is celebrated, not as a holiday of hard obligation, but as one of praise and thanksgiving.

Quite as pointedly stands forth the Corpus Christi procession. Beautiful as this can be even within the limits of a parish church, the far-reaching effect is never so apparent as when this Corpus Christi procession goes forth under the blue sky of the beautiful season in which it occurs. In our own country, these open-air processions are left to those favored regions under monastic patronage, inviting, as they do, not only their own communities, but the inhabitants for ten, twenty miles often, to share in the gracious hospitality of this Feast of Divine Love. Of the beauty of such processions as we have enjoyed in these favored districts, it would be vain to write; above all, when, as at Notre Dame, Indiana, nature has lent herself so completely to their service as to reflect in her pellucid lakes the procession on their shores, until we repeat that line from Wordsworth:

"The swan on sweet Saint Mary's lake  
Floats double, swan and shadow";

and we feel for the time being that nature is once more in accord with her Creator, no more to bring forth thorns and thistles as her participation in man's fall, but to join with him in the joyous canticles of a renovated world.

By such celebrations of great festivals has the Liturgy, as we have said, educated entire Europe, all Christian Asia, Africa on her Mediterranean shore and her Cape of Good Hope. To America, and these United States of America, she holds out the same gracious privileges, not only of civilization in its work-a-day prosperity, but of that highest culture which is not merely of the



intellect, but of the heart, the soul; making an atmosphere in which the most sensitive imagination is conscious of delightful conditions of grace, which in themselves are inspirations. To cut off or suppress these celebrations for ever so short a time, as we feel only too keenly in our own country, with our mixed population, is to deprive whole generations of what all the books in the world will vainly endeavor to supply,—the enthusiasm of actual participation; and how many a heaven-sent vocation has been stimulated, actually brought to consciousness, by some one of these solemnities cherished in the Liturgy?

As we write, across the village street we see a group of children training a young goat to follow them and come to serve them. How do they set to work? First one dimpled hand, then another, plucks a clover blossom from the road-side, and holds it temptingly to the shy animal; and as he nibbles it daintily, a tuft of fresh leaves is held towards him by another until the goat follows his young friends at their will, thus fulfilling St. Augustine's declaration, illustrated by this very example, that "we are drawn by our likings."

Noble eras of faith and of enthusiasm, of august celebration of those feasts which recognize the eternal destinies of mankind, and set forth the fulness of our Redemption. Noble eras, which nourished not only a St. Dominic, a St. Francis of Assisi, but a Dante, a Perugino, and the Angelical Doctor, St. Thomas of Aquin, evidencing that piety, poesy, painting, philosophy are alike guided by those glorious rubrics of a divine Liturgy which stand along the mountain side, beckoning us onward to those summits of ecstatic contemplation where we enter, with St. John, upon the life of vision, and which has been the inspiration of genius as well as of sanctity, lo! these nineteen hundred years, and will be to the end of time.

---

## IRELAND'S CAUSE, IRELAND'S LEADER.

ONLY a few months ago the friends of Ireland throughout the civilized world were anxiously watching the struggle for Home Rule carried on by the Irish Parliamentary party under Parnell, and powerfully aided by the veteran Gladstone and the Liberals of Great Britain. The questions which the most experienced and sagacious observers asked themselves were: "Will the long tried endurance of the Irish agricultural population hold out till the end of the present Parliament? Will the desperate resistance of the wretched tenantry not give way to the ever-increasing energy of Secretary Balfour's coercive measures, to the skilfully combined assaults of both the constabulary and the military? Where are the many thousands of evicted tenant-farmers, whose numbers are fearfully swelled of late, to look to for money to provide them with the bare necessities of life while they heroically 'keep their grip of the land?'"

Such questions we asked ourselves as the autumn of 1890 drew nigh, and the dreadful spectre of famine arose and stalked abroad in the open daylight in the desolated districts of the south and west of Ireland, adding the horrors of possible starvation and fever to the chronic and manifold evils of the Irish farmer's lot.

The exploring tour undertaken by the Irish Secretary through Ireland, through the distressed districts of Connaught and Munster especially, surprised not a few even of the most observant. But to those who knew with what formidable armed forces Mr. Balfour had garrisoned every mile of Irish ground, it was clear that he had nothing to fear. While he was pursuing his exploration, the O'Shea trial, which good people had hoped never to hear of again, was announced, all of a sudden, as about to be brought to a final issue.

This suit—and the Salisbury government were well aware of it—was the last and most masterly movement in their strategy against the National cause.

At the first credible reports of great distress and probable famine in one-half at least of Ireland, the generous American heart was moved; and forthwith public meetings were held, an organization was formed for the relief of the sufferers, and well-known citizens, Americans of the Americans, appealed to their countrymen for prompt succor. . . . Just then came among us a deputation of the Irish Parliamentary party, with the two-fold

purpose of soliciting pecuniary aid in favor of the multitudes of tenants evicted by Balfour's merciless magistracy and constabulary, and for helping to carry on the parliamentary campaign in favor of Home Rule. The visitors, while among us, were to explain to the citizens of the great republic in every State of the Union, the objects for which Parnell, Gladstone and their followers contended.

It had been remarked that when the proposed visit to this country of the Irish representatives was made known in Ireland, indictments for conspiracy and violation of the Crimes' Act were brought against Messrs. Dillon and O'Brien, the most deservedly popular of the Nationalist leaders, the very men whose simple appearance in any American city, or among the least Irish of American audiences, was sure to create enthusiasm. Few words would be needed from such men, so tried and so true, to obtain from our people much more than the advocates of Home Rule would ask for.

Mr. Balfour knew this, and he hoped to defeat the appeal of Ireland to the American republic by sending once more to prison and the plank-bed, John Dillon and William O'Brien. But the imprisonment of these two patriots under such circumstances would not have quenched the ardent sympathy felt here for Irish wrongs nor closed our hearts and our purses to the need of Ireland.

They baffled Balfour and came to us. The world knows what a welcome we gave them. They kindled a flame of enthusiasm in favor of Irish nationality which spread over the continent, crossing our border to Canada and warming up its less ardent population to give, in due time, practical aid to the righteous cause of Ireland.

The funds contributed for the Home Rule campaign promised already to go far beyond hundreds of thousands of dollars—when the anti-Irish conspiracy in Great Britain suddenly "played its trump card." The O'Shea case was called. The "respondent" obstinately refused to appear or to put in an answer. Of course, the "co-respondent" could not appear alone. And so, while the members of the Irish deputation were busy canvassing the Eastern and Middle States, the Atlantic cables brought, morning and evening, to our daily papers the delectable details of the one-sided testimony furnished by Captain O'Shea.

Men asked each other, in surprise or alarm, as they did, during the first sham-trial before Lord Coleridge about "Parnellism and Crime," and throughout the weary months of the second trial before the Judicial Commission—the most solemn judicial farce



mentioned in all history—whether Mr. Parnell was really the author of the forged letters, and whether the Parliamentary party were a band of criminals who had been long conspiring in the dark to violate or defy the most sacred laws of a Christian community.

The thunder-clap of the Pigott confession and suicide did not suffice to overthrow the Salisbury-Balfour Cabinet. The light poured on the public mind by the protracted sessions of the Judicial Commission, though it convinced the whole civilized world outside of Great Britain of the iniquity of British governmental methods in Ireland—could not open the eyes of the three judges. Their report and the subsequent parliamentary debates thereon were a disgrace to constitutional procedure, an insult to the intelligence of the English-speaking world.

The *Times*-Balfour-Salisbury conspiracy having utterly broken down and reflected nothing but discredit on British justice, English common sense, and both the Parliament and the Judiciary of England—the conspirators used their wits in another direction. They had failed in their endeavor to dishonor the Irish leader, and thereby to turn away from him the party whom he had formed and disciplined, and failed as well in thereby depriving the Irish Nationalists of the support of Mr. Gladstone and the British Liberals.

The money spent in purchasing the wretched tools of this gigantic conspiracy and in covering the expenses of a trial and proceedings, surpassing in magnitude, if not in duration, the trial of Warren Hastings, would have sufficed to open and establish once and for all time the fisheries of Ireland, creating fishing centres, docks and harbors all around her coast.

Time which ends by tearing the mask from the deepest hypocrites and the veil from the darkest plots, may possibly reveal to us some day, sooner even than we think, how the enemies of Ireland planned and achieved, for the time being, and to all human seeming, the defeat of the Irish national cause, the overthrow of the fondest, holiest hopes ever cherished by a people.

The clever strategy of the Tory leaders and of their zealous helpmates in the daily press, was further shown in the way they had studied the weak points in the Irish Parliamentary party and in the English Liberal party under Gladstone respectively.

It was no secret that more than one among the followers of Parnell occasionally showed signs of restiveness under the stern control and severe discipline enforced by the leader. No matter how much the cleverest among them owed to Mr. Parnell, who has discovered their talents and encouraged their forensic efforts,

it was not in human nature, not even in Irish human nature, not to push for a foremost place. We need only recall what happened in Ireland when the ill-starred election took place in Galway, at which Mr. Parnell braved the resentment of the foremost men in his party, by bringing forward the now notorious O'Shea. It was no secret that Parnell's somewhat autocratic interference had severely tested the temper and obedience of his followers. Nor was the name of his candidate then mentioned without mysterious and angry mutterings, to which every succeeding year added a fuller significance.

It had been well for the Irish leader, and well for Ireland's dearest interests, had he who was most concerned heeded the warnings such mutterings convey or read the signs of uneasiness, dissatisfaction and discontent, which should have pointed the attention of a nature more passionate and a mind less sagacious to the rocks on which he must shipwreck his honor and the cause of a nation, should he refuse to alter his course.

The moral sensitiveness of a man so stainless in his private life as Mr. Gladstone, was also counted upon as well as the high value set upon the public morality of political leaders by the English, Scotch and Welsh Dissenters, who sent so many representatives to swell the ranks of the Liberal party. It is a curious study to read not only the utterances of the Church of England religious press, but those of the Dissenting organs, from the very first moment the O'Shea trouble was mentioned, and all through the subsequent phases of the unsavory trial. It was easy to see that a deep feeling of distrust was growing steadily against Mr. Parnell, and that a powerful current of public opinion was being set in motion against him in the Liberal constituencies. Not of a sudden, therefore, nor without loud and reiterated warning, did the Protestant pulpit speak after the divorce court had given its verdict.

We are not here contrasting what might seem the ultra Puritanical character of public opinion or British political morality at the present day, or as manifested in the late disastrous events, with the moral looseness and apparent unscrupulousness of political parties in the past. What is the use of bringing into the argument great names on which some blemish rests, or notorious names of men who led their party to victory, or who governed with splendid ability a country that did not care or dare to lift the veil from their private life? Were we to make or to quote parables, they might apply on both sides of the ocean.

There was, when the O'Shea trial came up in November, a golden opportunity for Mr. Parnell to satisfy his countrymen that

his honor was untouched, and thereby to maintain his position as the National leader. This he could and should have done by acting exactly in accordance with his own precedent on the occasion of the production of the Pigott forgeries. Mr. Parnell, from his place in the House of Commons, then solemnly pledged his word of honor that the letters never had been written by him. This perfectly satisfied the Irish people and the Liberal party in England. It satisfied all but the most incredulous and bigoted Tories that a forgery had been committed, and that both the *Times* and the government were in greater peril than the honor of the Irish leader.

In November last, when the divorce court was sitting, and Mr. Parnell's honor was questioned and involved in the issue, when, too, he was told by more than one voice in the public press and one friend in private, that if the verdict went against him he must descend from his position as leader of a great national party,—what was his conduct?

Did he publish letter, address or manifesto affirming on his honor as a gentleman that he was guiltless of the crime—no less heinous than forgery—laid to his charge by his once friend and follower, Captain O'Shea?

Neither then, nor since, not even when a simple though solemn denial of guilt would have saved the Irish party from disruption, and turned away from the National cause the mortal blow aimed at it,—did Mr. Parnell vouchsafe one word of denial or self-justification.

To all who to the last clung to the belief that Mr. Parnell was innocent and that the O'Shea lawsuit was only the last act in the Tory conspiracy against Ireland, which would result in Mr. Parnell's turning the tables on his slanderers, his conduct on the above occasion was a sore disappointment.

It is true that some vague passages in Mr. Parnell's public utterances have been interpreted as a request that his friends and the nation at large shall suspend judgment in his case. And we are also aware that a theory of his innocence has been seriously entertained, based on the eccentricities and peculiar methods of the man, notably his action at the time of the Pigott investigation. Still, the fact stares us in the face, that not a single formal, authentic and unquestionable assurance of innocence has by him been given to any one.

But be that as it may, his guilt or his innocence forms no essential factor in the solution of the Irish problem as it now confronts us. The public will discuss and solve the question of criminality or guiltlessness according to its own partiality, prejudices or passions.



If the verdict of guilty is final and general, men of the world will not be at a loss to find circumstances which will appeal to the compassionate and merciful side of our nature.

If Mr. Parnell is really innocent, and can triumphantly prove himself to be so, he may indeed thus vindicate his personal purity, but the vindication must henceforth be at the expense of his political sagacity. For, he the leader of a nation, by his very willingness to appear guilty, has precipitated in Irish affairs the same disastrous consequences as if he were the guilty and dishonored man Captain O'Shea has been endeavoring to prove him to be. It was unpardonable, considering the position he held among a people so proverbially pure and so watchfully jealous of the sanctity of their homes, in Mr. Parnell to continue his relations with the O'Sheas after the Galway election, together with his suspicious and mysterious conduct ever since.

This is a first count on which the verdict of public opinion must be against him.

The second fault committed by him, in this regard, was his not making known to the men who had a right to his confidence, some good reason for the silence maintained by him after the verdict in the divorce suit was rendered; and, more especially for not reaffirming the assurances given to the Archbishop of Dublin when the divorce proceedings were first instituted.

A learned jurist once said that "the next thing to being right was to *appear to be right*." If this be true—and it is most certainly—surely the worst thing conceivable for the cause of Ireland was that her chosen and popularly idolized leader should be really innocent of the one sin most abhorrent to Irishmen next to faithlessness to God, while allowing himself deliberately to be proclaimed or to be held guilty of it.

Under whichever of these two aspects we view the case of Mr. Parnell, we are compelled to say that he has betrayed a weakness of which he was not suspected, grievous moral frailty, on the one hand, and a woful lack of political sagacity on the other. Both together, like the breaking down of the main-shaft and the in-rush of the mad waters on the "City of Paris," have left the Irish cause helpless and adrift in mid-ocean. The leaders in Parliament and the Irish people at home and abroad have, by this sad blundering, become the prey of deplorable dissensions. The question forces itself on all serious-minded men: How can a man so discredited by his own fault or by his lack of judgment in such a momentous crisis, ever hope to resume his former usefulness as the leader of the National party?

Another feature of this sadly memorable series of events is the part taken by the body of Irish archbishops and bishops in their

endeavor to save the life of their nation and the cause of Home Rule, by saving the unity and integrity of the Parliamentary party, by laboring to reunite its two sections, and by securing to them the continued support of the English Liberals.

This is a point on which the Irish hierarchy have been both misunderstood and misrepresented. Let us here remind Irish-American Catholics that the part which the bishops and priests of Ireland have, perforce, to play in so momentous a crisis in the history of their nation, can neither be compared to, nor judged by, the conduct of our own bishops and clergy here in the United States.

Home Rule, and all that goes to constitute a real and effective independence for Ireland, can only be won by constitutional methods, with the active and generous co-operation of the British Liberals, aided by the ever-growing public opinion in Great Britain in favor of long-denied justice to Ireland. But the only national movement carried on in Ireland on constitutional lines, which this British public opinion could sanction and successfully support, is one in which the great vital force of Religion would form *one* with the united forces of patriotism and politics. Bishops and priests, the people and their representatives, must be the strands of the cable binding all classes together, and the core of that cable must be Religion, firing the national soul with its incomparable energies.

This was the hopeful condition of things in November, 1889, when Mr. Parnell went to Hawarden to consult Mr. Gladstone on the prospects of the Irish question in the contingency of an early dissolution of Parliament, and of a general election favorable to the Liberals in the three kingdoms.

We say, that Religion was then the chief unifying and energizing element in the National movement. In the autumn of 1889, as in that of 1890, this was so confessedly the case, that the Tory journals and their Roman correspondents were continually setting afloat rumors about the Vatican's interference with Irish politics. People on both sides of the Atlantic, who knew anything about the sentiments of the Pope, were thoroughly aware that he had, again and again, expressed his opinion that the National cause was a just one, and that all just-minded men must wish it success, so long as it was carried on in accordance with legal and constitutional methods. No word was ever spoken or written by him, save only to keep the Irish Nationalists from employing, in the furtherance of their sacred Cause, any means of a nature to injure it in the eyes of God and man. He was, and is, and ever must be, anxious to see the vital interests of an ancient Catholic nation kept free from guilty or questionable agencies—so dear to the venerable Pontiff are the righteous claims of the Irish people!

English intrigue and influence in Rome, as well as Tory man-

œuvres in London and Dublin, were used to weaken or divide the Irish episcopacy, standing practically, as it did, a unit for Home Rule, during the twelvemonth elapsed since the now memorable Hawarden conference, and the issuing, on November 29, 1890, of Mr. Parnell's Manifesto. The bishops at the first sounds of discord in the Parliamentary party, at the first notice of the reopening of the O'Shea divorce suit, were very reasonably alarmed at the probable consequences to the cause so dear to them and to the august head of the Church.

What did the Irish bishops do in this trying emergency? Remembering the assurance that Mr. Parnell had commissioned Michael Davitt to give to Archbishop Walsh, at the first inception of the divorce proceedings, that he would come out of the ordeal with his honor free of spot and untarnished, they did simply what thousands and tens of thousands of their fellow-countrymen did throughout the world, they waited—patiently, prayerfully, hopefully—for that one word of reassurance from Mr. Parnell which would have gladdened their hearts and lifted the cloud from their unhappy country. But, alas! they waited in vain, for that word was never spoken; and so they acted—and acted only as the religious teachers and the moral guides of a Catholic people could act. The task was a sad one, but its performance was imperative. Guilty or innocent, Mr. Parnell himself had made it so.

To those who understand anything of the relations of the Irish bishops and priests to the Irish people and their political movements, and especially during the present crisis, their action needs no explanation or defence. They were the backbone of the whole struggle from the very beginning, and to their influence, both at home and in America, more than to any other one agency, is due its magnificent success at every stage. Therefore, it was to them that the people first looked in the hour of doubt and danger, as they ever will look in trial or in triumph, as their safest guides and truest friends.

The bishops of Ireland, not only by their position, but by the well-deserved confidence of all past generations, are the natural guardians of the nation's interests, and as much looked up to for a faithful discharge of their trust as are the National representatives in Parliament.

Their action, during the lamentable occurrences which have filled the past two months, was not an uncalled for, unwelcome, or obtrusive meddling with politics outside of the sphere of their sacred ministry. It was the performance of a high and holy duty, one which they owed to Ireland and to Religion.

And that some such document as the Address of the Episcopal Standing Committee was expected by the great body of the Irish



people, is furthermore proved by the fact that during the entire period when the divorce proceedings were so painfully fixing men's attention, no accredited organ in the Nationalist press ventured to say that Parnell, dishonored, should continue to be the leader of a Catholic nation proverbially chaste and cherishing the sanctities of the home. Mr. Parnell perfectly understood this when he commissioned Michael Davitt to assure the Irish archbishops and bishops of his innocence. And that he fully appreciated the position of the Irish bishops and priests in the National struggle is afforded by the testimony of the present Archbishop of Cashel, who, at a memorable assembly held in Kildare, about mid-October, 1885, in presence of the Archbishop of Dublin, of several other prelates, of Mr. Parnell and others,—members of Parliament, clergymen, and leading gentlemen from the surrounding counties,—gave an historical account of the beginning of the Land League movement under Mr. Parnell's direction. He affirmed that Mr. Parnell came to him and declared, in view of the incalculable importance which the new agitation seemed likely or certain to attain, *that he was unwilling to take a single step without securing the sympathy and coöperation of the bishops and priests of Ireland.* This discourse, and Mr. Parnell's confirmatory reply, were made in the hearing of the author.<sup>1</sup>

The letter of Mr. Gladstone, calling for the withdrawal of Mr. Parnell, taken together with the verdict of the divorce court, seems to have disturbed the usual equanimity of a man weakened by long illness and racking anxieties. We cannot otherwise account for the contradictory judgments given by Mr. Parnell himself of the famous visit to Hawarden Castle, and his irreconcilable estimates of Mr. Gladstone's trustworthiness as an advocate of a full measure of Home Rule for Ireland.

Mr. Gladstone's letter, Mr. Parnell's Manifesto, and the subsequent letters and interviews of themselves and their friends, relating to the Hawarden conference are of too recent occurrence to need recounting here.

Setting aside the questions of consistency and truthfulness arising out of the painful conflict of statements and actions, comes another grave matter for wonder. How, if Mr. Parnell left Hawarden on December 19th, 1889, impressed, according to his own account, with the absolute inability or unwillingness of Mr. Gladstone and his associates to advocate for Ireland any but a most disappointing, unsatisfactory, and worthless scheme of self-government,—did Mr. Parnell again and again, at Liverpool and in London, proclaim to the world his grateful admiration of the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Life of John McHale, Archbishop of Tuam.*—N. Y., 1890.

Liberal party and its leader, and his firm and implicit confidence in the plan of Home Rule they were devising and elaborating?

Assuredly there is in the Parnell who speaks to Ireland and the world in the Manifesto just issued, and the Parnell who addressed the Parliamentary party at Westminster on June 30th last past, a self-contradiction most astounding.

That the alliance existing between the Irish Nationalists and the Liberal party of Great Britain, was looked upon by Irishmen at home and abroad as the only sure means, under God's good providence, of achieving such independence as we all hoped for, no one had asserted more solemnly and positively than Mr. Parnell himself, and on the public occasions adverted to within the last twelve months. He calls it "an honorable alliance, honorable and hopeful for our country, . . . an alliance which will last and bear permanent fruit."

No change, in so far as the public knows, had taken place in Mr. Parnell's mind in this regard, up to the verdict of the divorce court, Mr. Gladstone's letter requesting the Irish leader to retire from political life, and to the private entreaties of Mr. Parnell's lieutenants to the same effect.

If Mr. Gladstone, in the conversations at Hawarden, had only given to Mr. Parnell nothing but the most unsatisfactory plan of settlement described in the Manifesto, then the latter was most culpable in speaking in Liverpool and afterwards at the banquet in Westminster of the alliance between the Irish Nationalists and the Liberal party, and of the forthcoming satisfactory and acceptable scheme of Home Rule. Putting together these speeches and the revelations of the manifesto, we say that Mr. Parnell was guilty of almost a crime for having so monstrously deceived his countrymen and the followers who were exposing their very lives.

It must be borne in mind, that not only all through the year 1890, but ever since the accession to power of the Tories under Lord Salisbury, they had been using every artifice to discover the precise nature of Mr. Gladstone's new plan for Home Rule and the settlement of the Irish question, in the probable and near event of a general election resulting favorably to the Liberals. The persistent efforts made to force Mr. Gladstone "to show his hand," or to obtain, at least indirectly, from the leaders of the Irish party some clew to Mr. Gladstone's next Home Rule scheme, were well known to all politicians. It was, then, and for obvious reasons, most important that this scheme, while in preparation, should be kept a profound secret by the leaders on both sides. And, inasmuch as the "suggested" measures which were the subject of the conversation at Hawarden, were not kept secret from Sir William Harcourt and Mr. John Morley, in like manner are we justified in

believing that Mr. Parnell was expected, on his side, to inform such of his own colleagues as Mr. Justin McCarthy, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Dillon, and Mr. William O'Brien, of Mr. Gladstone's intended measures. We consider that, under the circumstances, and in view especially of the defects of the discussed scheme as after revealed by the Irish leader, he failed in performing an essential duty to his party and to the Irish nation. The proposed scheme of self-government for Ireland as known to the Liberal leader and his chief colleagues, was of far more vital importance to Ireland than to Great Britain. Mr. Parnell was not, in any sense, so wholly and exclusively entrusted with the vital interests of his nation and people, that not one among their representatives deserved to be let into the secret of what Mr. Gladstone was preparing to do or not to do to fulfil the hopes and satisfy the just claims of Irishmen. Had his most trustworthy colleagues been judged worthy of his confidence and treated with the regard shown by Mr. Gladstone to Harcourt and Morley, how different would the condition of the Irish party now be! and how hopeful Irishmen everywhere could feel of seeing the Parnell incident closed without disaster to their Cause! There could have been no need of such a Manifesto as that so suddenly sprung upon the nation and the entire Irish race all over the world as that issued in the last days of November. The members of the Irish parliamentary party made acquainted with the nature of Mr. Gladstone's proposals, would not have allowed the year 1890 to pass without insisting on further consultation with Mr. Gladstone, and without urging on him their conviction that the plan of self-government discussed at Hawarden was no settlement at all, and never could be accepted by Ireland. We believe, in that view, that the discourses delivered in Liverpool and at the banquet in Westminster would either never have been spoken, or that their fulsome praise of Mr. Gladstone and his party would have been founded on more substantial promises than those given on December 18 and 19, 1889. At any rate, Mr. Parnell would have, to confirm his account of the Hawarden Conference, the testimony of his own trusted colleagues, to whom he must have, as in duty bound, communicated the result of the Conference, on leaving Hawarden. Then the world would have been spared the pain of contrasting Mr. Parnell's unsupported, somewhat confused, and contradictory statements, with the peremptory denials of Mr. Gladstone, Sir William Harcourt, and Mr. Morley. In our judgment the cause of the present unfortunate imbroglio is in great measure the consequence of Mr. Parnell's excessive, impolitic and unwise secretiveness on the one hand, and on the other of his violation of the state secret confided to him. It was a grave political blunder, to give all at once to the



public what had not been deemed fit to trust to the most honored members of the Irish party.

Whoever may henceforward be chosen to lead the Irish Nationalist members of Parliament, must not so isolate himself from his associates, as to be or to appear to be a kind of dictator, bearing within his own breast the mightiest State secrets and consulting no one in matters and emergencies involving the ruin of a Cause and the very life of a nation. It is not so that Americans understand political leadership. It is not so understood by the two great British parties. Why should it be understood differently in Ireland?—as if the Irish National movement were something like the insurrection of the Roman slaves under Spartacus, in which a servile mob blindly followed its leader, as fearful of his rebuke or his lash, as of the threats of their masters and oppressors of yesterday.

There are few, if any, incidents on record in the most momentous debates of any representative assembly that can be compared in thrilling dramatic interest to the passage of arms between Mr. Sexton and Mr. Parnell during the stormy debate of December 1st. The former had been, together with the members of the opposing majority, openly, formally accused of having allowed "their integrity and independence to be sapped and destroyed" by the radical wing of the Liberal party.

"Integrity," proudly replies Mr. Sexton, "is not an unconditional acceptance of the views of any man. Independence is not submission to the will of any man. We are your colleagues, Mr. Parnell, but we are not your slaves. . . . I claim in the face of the world; I claim in the presence of the Most High, that the integrity of the Irish party is unstained, and that its independence is absolute. The question—the urgent question—is between the leader we have loved, whom we never can forget and whose useful tenure of his position circumstances have rendered impossible—and between the *Cause* to which our fealty is due. If the leader is retained, in my judgment, the Cause is lost. If the Cause is to be won, the leader must retire."

This is the very soul of the Irish question: the *Cause of Ireland* must be the supreme law for every National leader. The leader must be guided by the vital interests of that Cause; nor should these interests and that Cause ever be made secondary or subservient to the interests of any one man or party.

The joint letter of the delegates of the Parliamentary party in America, when it became a sad but urgent necessity for them to declare publicly their dissent from Mr. Parnell's Manifesto, contains a paragraph which should be reproduced here for more than one reason. They say: "The Manifesto of Mr. Parnell . . . cuts us off

from the last hopes to which we clung, anxious (as we were) to avoid uttering a word that might embitter the controversy. We shall not dwell on the cruel injustice with which he treats the members of the party, who followed him with a loyalty and affection such as no leader ever experienced before. His recollection of their fealty to him in many an hour of trial might well have saved them from the imputation that any section of them could have allowed their integrity to be sapped by Liberal wire-pullers. Nor would we do more than enter a protest against this violation of all constitutional principle in flouting by anticipation the decision of the elected representatives of the people, from whose votes the chairman of the Parliamentary party receives his authority, and resorting to a vague general appeal over their heads.

"Considerations like these we should willingly have waived in the interest of the national solidarity. But the method in which, ignoring the origin of the present calamitous situation, Mr. Parnell endeavors to fasten the responsibility for it upon Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Morley, compels us to dissociate ourselves in the strongest manner from the imputation which we believe to be reckless and unjust. . . .

"Deliberately bringing things to this position, Mr. Parnell has entered upon a rash and fatal path, upon which every consideration for Ireland's safety, as well as our personal honor, forbids us to follow him."

Passing over the deplorable scenes enacted before and during the Kilkenny election, and writing while the conferences at Boulogne between Mr. Parnell and Mr. O'Brien are still in progress, one thing seems clear, that Mr. Parnell must retire from the National leadership. But who is to succeed him?

Parnell, as we now convince ourselves, has what the French call *les défauts de ses qualités*, "the very defects or excesses rather of his acknowledged qualities." No one, up to the moral cataclysm which followed the verdict of the divorce court, could justly deny him the elements of leadership. He was skilful, sagacious, cool, deliberate, courageous and firm. We need not, after what precedes, dwell on his defects. A few months ago, ere the blight of a dishonored name had fallen on him, and ere the "hard necessities" of retaining his leadership had made him recklessly unjust to the Liberal party, and the English people, to his faithful colleagues and to his country, the Irish race everywhere was proud of him, worshipped him.

He was identified with the *Cause* of Ireland; that *Cause* had made him what he was.

He had been able, with the co-operation of a united people and clergy, to make a living and powerful reality in Parliament of the

Independent Party of Opposition, which John of Tuam strenuously advocated all his life, which O'Connell sought to create; which the great Archbishop of the West preached so eloquently after O'Connell had passed away, after the Catholic Defence Association had disappeared in the Sadlier-Keogh betrayal; and pressed unweariedly on public attention until the new Home Rule movement under Isaac Butt sprang up and fired the soul of the nation. The moral force wielded by Isaac Butt, Mr. Parnell had the sagacity to grasp and to increase.

This party of Independent Opposition and the Land League movement started by Michael Davitt had carried the car of Charles Stewart Parnell triumphantly forward till the end of last November. All the moral forces which stirred the depths of a nation's soul and inspired the hopes of all its past generations, Mr. Parnell wielded as the electrician uses the mighty elementary forces of nature.

These great moral forces existed in the past in greater volume even than at present. But Irish statesmen or politicians knew not how to store up these resistless energies in unity. It shall ever be Parnell's glory that he may be said to have created and kept together an independent parliamentary party such as Ireland never had known till now. Supported by the Catholic masses and by their religious guides, and appealing to legal and constitutional methods only, he forced the Liberal party of Great Britain and its leaders to confess that all the former methods of government in Ireland had been wrong, cruel, unjust and oppressive. *Justice* alone must be tried and coercion abandoned. And so the Cause of Ireland, represented by a compact body of eighty-six Irish representatives in the Imperial Parliament, advocated by Mr. Gladstone and the great Liberal party, supported by a majority of the people of Great Britain and by the constantly increasing public opinion of the three kingdoms and of the English-speaking world,—was morally certain of a great legislative victory in the near future—when in last November came the O'Shea verdict and Mr. Parnell's Manifesto.

But though the leader has fallen, the Cause is not lost. It is a most just Cause; and *justice* is immortal and eternal.

Mr. Parnell was heard with attention both in the British Senate and all over the civilized world; because his voice was that of Ireland, too long misgoverned and oppressed.

Is her Cause so absolutely identified with Mr. Parnell's fortunes, that his disgrace, or his retirement from political life, or even his death, would so paralyze her voice, so injure her claims, that the people of Great Britain, so lately awakening to the sense of her cruel wrongs, would close their ears, their minds, their hearts to



what justice, humanity and their own dearest political interests demand in favor of the sister island?

And will Irishmen and men of Irish race consent to bury forever out of sight and beneath the earth that Cause of Ireland, so enthusiastically upheld but yesterday? God knows, we Irishmen are clannish enough; and this very clannishness, the devotion to a name and a man, the narrow love of the tribe and the locality in preference to the country and the nation, has been too often our bane in the past. It dashed all the hopes of our people and rendered useless all the slaughters and sacrifices made for religion and nationality for the past two or three centuries.

That this clannishness is not a thing of the past, what has just happened in Ireland, as well as in our own free America, proves but too conclusively. The name of the man, not that of the Cause or the country, is the spell our speakers conjure with, the will-o'-the-wisp which leads our countrymen astray and lands their country's Cause in quagmires from which there seems no escape.

We must learn to love Ireland for her own sake, not for the sake of the men who represent or misrepresent her. We must be devoted to the *Cause* through good repute and evil repute, through good and ill fortune, because we believe it to be a Cause fated never to be lost.

It depends on us, on Irishmen in the three kingdoms, and on Irishmen here and wherever the English language is spoken, to prevent the Cause of Ireland from being a lost Cause. The man who shall be chosen to succeed Mr. Parnell, will be the lawful representative of the *Cause*, and bear the flag around which all should rally, who deserve the name of Irishmen.

This is no time to listen to the utterances of the Tory press at home, or to the correspondents of such of our great journals as love to echo the sentiments and prophesies of the enemies of Ireland and Home Rule. And if we cease to quarrel among ourselves in the United States, and if we give our united aid and sympathy to the men who are fighting in the gap at home, and upholding the Cause and the flag, we shall easily win back to both, the American friends we have lost by our bickerings and dissensions.

A leader will have to be chosen, competent to speak for the party in the House of Commons, to occupy officially the place just made vacant, to be the acknowledged and respected representative of Ireland in dealing with Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues. We do not see among the Irish Parliamentary party any one man, who may, for the time being at least, enjoy the confidence won by Mr. Parnell as a statesman, debater and leader. But whoever is<sup>a</sup> chosen, he will be a man of ability and unblemished char-

acter. There are, among his followers, no lack of tried, varied and eminent talent; there are plenty of men to do, and do well, all the work which the coming struggle for final success will put upon them.

Present divisions and the awful dangers which these threaten for Ireland, will, we doubt not, serve to make the present majority more united than ever before. Let them show to the minority, the present dissentients, that forbearance and spirit of conciliation, to be expected from true patriots working disinterestedly for the noblest of causes, and there will be soon no minority.

The friends of Ireland among the English, Scotch and Welsh Liberals, are too sensible and too honest to give up the Cause of Ireland, for which they have sacrificed so much, for the faults or failings of one man or a few. They, too, have been for years eloquently, generously pleading that Cause before the public opinion of their country. The case is still on trial; the jury have not returned the verdict which shall be the verdict of an empire. What if the chief advocate of the plaintiff has fallen helpless in court before bringing his plea to a successful issue? The evidence is there; and the majority of the jury have spoken in no uncertain tones. The excitement and uncertainties of the present hour are rapidly passing away and the English constituencies, with whom rest the final decision, will deal out that measure of justice to Ireland, which equity, policy and Christianity demand.

One consideration we must, in concluding, press upon Irish Catholics in America, and that is, that no man who has read of the struggles of the Irish nation ever since the days of the Eighth Henry, but must know that the dominant power, which aimed to extinguish Irish nationality aimed also to extinguish with it the Catholic faith. It would be both ingratitude and suicidal madness to tell the Catholic bishops and priests to stand aside and let the battle go on without them, when they have been the very soul of the struggle. Ireland, we hope, in conquering her constitutional freedom, her full right of self-government, will remain evermore a Catholic nation.

People and priests and friends of Ireland, stand together!

---

## FINANCIAL RELATION OF CHURCH AND STATE IN FRANCE.

AT the epoch of the French Revolution, the possessions of the Catholic Church in France, having a recognized legal status, whether for the benefit of designated churches, convents, seminaries, charitable or educational foundations, monasteries, or endowments for special pious purposes, yielded, even under the paternal administration of religious custodians, an annual income of two hundred millions of francs—equivalent to a much larger sum in modern times.

The great capital which produced this revenue had been aggregating for centuries; it consisted mainly in productive estate, derived from the bounty of Christian monarchs, princes, nobles, and wealthy individuals; including vast tracts of productive land which had, in the course of time, been reclaimed from a waste and barren state by the labor of monastics.

It has been stated that the beneficiaries of this income, from the highest to the lowest functionary or dependant, numbered 400,000.

The Church, the royalty, and the nobility of title and of robe, were the established privileged orders in France. The Church was not accountable for the alleged faults or crimes of the other orders; she had been the solace of the poor and the afflicted; and she had stood between the peasant and his lord, when the oppression of the latter trenched upon morality or justice; nevertheless, she was made to pay the penalty of her co-existing rank.

Her extensive estates and properties, in common with those of the crown and of the nobility, were sequestered to the state by the revolutionary Convention.

The overthrow of this grand fabric of religion in France was complete; but the martyrdom of so many venerable and holy servants of God, which accompanied its prostration, amid the carnage and disorders consequent upon the upheaval of the impoverished and maddened people of France, was apparently the purchase-price of its subsequent restoration.

In the beginning of the present century, Divine Providence made Napoleon the factor by which religion was restored to France. Had the great soldier fulfilled the trust with sincerity, his own destiny and the destiny of Europe might have been far different; but, after re-establishing the hierarchy and installing the priesthood, he was tempted by ambition to subordinate the universal Church to his power, and he sought to yoke the venerable Vicar



of Christ to his triumphant chariot; his failure maddened him; his persecution of the saintly Pontiff drew upon his head the wrath of God, and his meteoric career was ended in bitter exile.

The reconstruction of the hierarchy and of the priesthood upon the desolated religious foundations of France was accomplished upon a scale much less grand, and was, probably, more practically suited to the actual necessities of the people and of the times, than when the Church had flourished side by side with royalty and its surroundings.

The hierarchical system was modified by the consolidation of some episcopal sees, and by the cancellation, so to speak, of others; probably half the number of archbishops and bishops replaced the venerable prelates who had been guillotined or exiled, while 30,000 priests were appointed to care for twice the number of desolate parishes.

The restoration of religion and the reconstruction of the hierarchical institutions, was accomplished by Napoleon under the conditions of a treaty concluded between the Holy See and the existing government of France at the time, commonly known in history as the Concordat of 1801.

As the revolutionary government had seized, confiscated, and, to a great extent, had sold, the productive property of the Church, which her ministry had, in a fiduciary capacity, during previous centuries administered for the maintenance of its support, and for religious purposes generally, so the state assumed the expense requisite for the support of the hierarchy and clergy of France, as re-established under the Concordat above referred to. This was the beginning of the present system, by which the archbishops, the bishops, and the clergy are paid a yearly salary by the state.

In the organic laws forming part of the treaty with the Holy See, and designed to give practical effect to its conditions, Napoleon fixed the yearly sum to be paid each class of incumbents; the salary of the hierarchy was passably fair, for that time, but for the lesser hierarchy and the clergy generally, it was very small.

No increase was made in the scale of salaries during the first Empire, but after the restoration of the Bourbons the salaries of the bishops were increased about twenty-five per cent.; that of the canons, vicars-general, and curés, proportionally; while the vicaires, or assistant priests, were only moderately cared for. This was seventy-five years ago, since which, the scale of salaries has remained as was thus augmented.

The insufficiency of the government allowance under the Concordat, for the support of the hierarchy and clergy of France, was the subject of a brochure written sometime since, by Monseigneur Guilbert, bishop of Gap.

According to this prelate, the yearly salary of an archbishop is \$4000. That of a bishop, \$3000.

These salaries are paid out of the public revenues of France and are, in all respects, government salaries, "as much as are the salaries of a postman or of a custom-house officer."

"But," says Bishop Guilbert, "it is not of record that any French bishop of recent times has enriched himself out of the allowance of the state for the administration of his see."

Vicars-general, who are next in rank, and who, in certain cases, become the representatives of their bishops, are paid a salary of \$500 per annum. They are not provided with residences by the state, and they have no fees, no extra allowances wherewith to supplement their salaries.

Canons are paid \$320 yearly salary, having to provide their own lodgings and, like the vicars-general, enjoy neither fees nor allowances.

"It will be seen," says Bishop Guilbert, "that some of the most venerable and distinguished of the French priesthood are compelled to live upon a yearly allowance which most employees in business affairs would look upon with contempt."

When the scale reaches the annual allowance paid by the state for the maintenance of parish priests and their assistants, the paltry provision made for their support becomes still more apparent when the responsible and confidential position filled by these incumbents is taken into account.

The yearly salary of a parish priest in France is \$300 for the first-class curé and \$240 for the second class.

The vicaire or assistant of the curé receives according to circumstances, from \$100 to \$180 per annum; when the latter incumbent shall have reached the age of 60, his salary is increased \$40 per annum.

In addition to these pittances, all that a French priest, doing parochial work and having no income from personal property, has to depend upon, is the fees, or "stoledues," of his sacerdotal office; the light shed upon this source of revenue derived by priests in France, by Bishop Guilbert, will probably surprise some of our American priests.

"The revenues," says the bishop, "of the French clergy derived from all casual sources put together, are of no importance save in a few parishes situated in the wealthy quarters of populous cities; and in these exceptional parishes the value of the fees and offerings is more than balanced by the continuous demands upon an incumbent's charity.

"Far, therefore, from growing rich by the revenues of his benefice, a curé is most likely to sink in any private property which

he may possess; and he rarely leaves a will of much consequence to legatees."

Bishop Guilbert states "that all the casual receipts of every parish priest in his diocese, if added together, would not average to each a sum of \$6 annually.

"In a neighboring diocese, moreover, another venerable prelate who carefully examined this subject, discovered that the receipts of his clergy from casual sources did not exceed 17 francs, or \$3.40, per annum for each parish, by general average."

The bishop also states "that the minds of conscientious prelates are frequently disturbed by the necessity which forces them to appoint to certain parishes, curés who are young men entirely without pecuniary resources; and who, on this account, are obliged, in order to provide a few indispensable articles such as are needed for household use in every establishment, however humble in its requirements, to contract debts which they can only discharge by long years of subsequent privation."

What a contrast with the way these things are managed among American Catholics!

Priests, worn out with worry and toil, after reaching the age of 65, may obtain from the government, upon their retirement, an annual allowance of \$120 *on certain conditions* which, however, Bishop Guilbert qualifies as exceedingly hard.

"He must, in the first place, be more than 65 years old and a curé of the first or second class; if he is only a vicaire or assistant, the annual allowance is fixed at \$100; if he is not over 65, the chances are that he will only be allowed \$60 per year;" at the end of his first year's retirement, he will be called upon to renew his application for a stipend for the ensuing year, and so on. Year after year, instead of being allowed to end his days without further anxieties, he is obliged to undergo the humiliating ordeal of a bureaucratic gauntlet, with its delays and possible insults, all of which cannot but be repugnant to the self-respect of the venerable, the refined and the scholarly men included among the beneficiaries of this modest stipend.

"In the larger cities, one-fifth of the rents for chairs in certain churches is set aside for the assistance of infirm priests; but the maximum of state, of parochial and of other aid for a worn out priest in France, having no assistance from family sources for his support in his old age, cannot exceed \$160 per annum, even were he able to obtain assistance from private subscriptions, which must, however, *have been authorized by the government.*"

There is a deep reverence in the average American Catholic heart for France.

She it was, under the old régime, who helped our colonial sires



to win their freedom, and later, dating from 1789, from her sanctuaries, which had been founded and sanctified by illustrious saints, came to our shores, exiles, the elite of the sacerdotal rank of all Europe; brilliant and holy men who, under the direction of Carroll, spread the faith in our undeveloped domain, laid the foundation of the American Church, became our missionary bishops and the precursors of the illustrious hierarchy of our present age.

To an American priest, this is a sad picture which Bishop Guilbert presents, even, if charitably applied only to the poorer of the rural provinces of old France. Does it not appear that many secular priests are so poor that, at times, they are forced to deny themselves the sweet consolation of the visit of a friend, in their modest presbytery, for lack of the means to provide for a few extra dinners or of a few bottles of wine? And how sad is the prospect of the priest without personal resources, who, when incapacitated by sickness or old age from doing parochial work, must fall back upon the alms of the state, which he can only obtain at the price of his self-respect?

The object of Bishop Guilbert's brochure was, apparently, to direct the attention of the Catholics of France to a subject in which they were deeply interested; and by the expose of the situation of their clergy, so far as had reference to the inadequacy of the provision made by the state for their support, to excite such influence as might induce the government to adopt a more liberal scale of remuneration for this overworked class of public servants; commensurate with duties "which neither time nor distance limits," and in some measure corresponding with other employees of the Government whose salaries had [not been fixed nearly a century ago; justly claiming that the cost of living is now much greater than when the present scale of salaries was established.

Unfortunately, the time was inopportune; each succeeding ministry has proved more radically opposed to Christianity.

Schools and charities have been laicised, religious institutions broken up, and one after another of the almoners, chaplains and religious directors of public institutions have been removed and replaced by unbelievers.

Generally speaking, the Catholics of France, from the small land-owners and moderately-provided rentiers—both classes quite numerous—to the bourgeoisie; and from the latter to the estated gentry and the hereditary nobility, are said to be, and they probably are, the most frugal and comparatively the richest in their respective classes in Europe; and yet the inference may be drawn from the preceding statements that the clergy have been permitted

to endure privations unbecoming their exalted station and their social position.

It might be suggested that the surroundings of the see of Gap are peculiarly exceptional as to condition and prosperity. It is the capital of the department of the Hautes Alpes, in Dauphiny, bordering on Piedmont, which has the smallest population and which is probably the poorest, in other respects, of the departments of France. The adjoining department, the Basses Alpes, having a little more territory and population, is about as poor; and in both may be found much of the fossilated *débris* of feudal times.

The departmental area of the Hautes Alpes comprises more than a million acres, one-fourth of which is probably cultivated; but the product of its soil does not sustain its 119,000 people.

Its chief city has been an episcopal see since the fourth century, and was at one time governed by a prince-bishop.

It has a record which is a history in itself, extending back to the Roman era; it had, in its prosperous days, a population of 16,500; but its historians allege that its decline has been the result of civil wars, plagues, Saracens, Lombards, Huguenots and, most of all, they say, the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Its present population does not exceed 6000.

So poor are the people of this department that 6000 adults migrate early in October, and of these, 5000 return the succeeding June, bringing home an average of forty dollars, saved from what they have earned during their wanderings as laborers, showmen, hawkers and musicians; while the remaining 1000 never return to their cantons; this is a loss equivalent to 4000 souls each year.

Rich only in the memory of feudal ages and surrounded with lovely and romantic alpine scenery, this diocese, with its sister in the adjoining department, are probably the poorest in all France, while decreasing in population year by year. Many of its outlying chapels and stations on mountain top or in deep valley, are almost inaccessible, and yet they are faithfully served by God's holy ministers. Taking into consideration the exceptional surroundings of the standpoint whence was directed the brochure of Bishop Guilbert, it is respectfully suggested that its worst inferences, accepted generally, would be unjust to the reputation of the great majority of the people of France.

It is more than probable that not only in the cities, but also in the greater number of the provincial parishes, the French clergy have been liberally aided by the municipal bodies in many departments in their religious work; and by individual contributions from the bourgeoisie as well as from the nobility; while their occasional requisitions for the promotion of missionary, of educational

and of charitable interests, have been liberally met where economical concurrence permitted.

Admitting as a fact that the legatees of deceased priests, have, as a rule, benefited little by their share of the "successions," and that prelates have also, as a rule, left small estates when called from this world, what higher tribute could be paid to the memory of a departed priest, than to say that he gave all his worldly means for the alleviation of human misery, or for the encouragement of piety and of morality where most needed.

The wisdom is all the more apparent, and the posthumous glory all the more certain of the French bishop, who, during life, while receiving the moderate salary paid by the State, did not put away a certain margin of it, but rather expended such surplus as his apostolic life admitted, where it would tell to the best advantage.

The admission of Bishop Guilbert that many newly-ordained curés, when assigned to duty, have no personal means, has probably suggested the remark made in certain quarters, that if the secular priesthood of the republic could be recruited to a greater extent than it is from the well-to-do classes, the hardships incidental to the sacerdotal state in parishes as poor in every way as those in the departments of the Basses and the Hautes Alpes, might be mitigated by the assignment of young curés having personal income, to those parishes most difficult to serve; where good conveyance and comfortable clothing are requisite for the incumbent when called by duty to out-of-the-way places.

These and other requisites for his presbytery, including a supply of medicine for the sick poor, his moderate salary could not provide, and the poverty of his parishioners would prevent assistance from the legitimate source.

In such cases, a personal income could not be put to a more charitable use than in providing the means for bringing promptly the consolations of religion to the faithful, whose humble homes were on some distant mountain side or in some valley equally difficult of access.

In the organic laws attached to the Concordat, Napoleon had inserted a clause forbidding the ordination of curés who had not an income of 300 francs per annum, equivalent to a capital of about \$1200.

This regulation, however, was not enforced after the return of the Bourbons.

Under the military code of France, company officers cannot marry unless they have a personal income outside the pay of their grade, which has been fixed at such an amount as would suffice for the support of their family in keeping with their rank.

It is, however, more than probable that for some time past the



greater number of vocations have been generated in respectable rural homes with traditional Catholic surroundings, however economical in other respects these surroundings may have been.

It may be, moreover, assumed that many French parents living in comfortable circumstances, would not care to foster a vocation in a son when a career in the secular priesthood during the present situation of affairs in France, was to compensate for the sundering of family ties so deeply cherished in the hearts of the people of the Gallic race.

The history of her wars during the present century, shows that France did not gain her great victories by soldiers from the faubourgs of her cities; these were won by the courage, the endurance, and the discipline of her conscripts from her rural cantons.

The young men of this age, providentially inspired with vocations for the priesthood, and who worthily embrace the sacerdotal state amid such adverse surroundings, may be relied upon in any exigency which future events may develop.

Of the thirty-eight millions comprising the population of France, probably thirty-four millions were baptized in the Catholic Church; and in the four millions forming the minority, is to be found the comparatively small infidel element whose compact organization has enabled it to grasp sufficient political power wherewith to influence other parties and virtually control the republic.

From an American standpoint it might be inferred that the Catholics of France lack unity and leadership; it is probable, too, that the bourgeoisie comprising the mercantile, the manufacturing and the banking interests, who are proverbially timid, have been too much moved to uneasiness, by the weather-worn scarecrows "Clericalism" and "Ultramontanism," paraded in political fields, as they were in the times preceding 1830 and 1848, when the infidel cry "à bas les Jésuites" was acknowledged to mean, down with Christianity. This is, however, a matter in which the French people themselves are most deeply interested. Some day there may rise up among them a Windhorst, who will unite their ranks and lead them to victory.

From an American standpoint again, does it not seem, to say the least, peculiar, that a French prelate as well as a curé, must present his formal voucher every quarter day to, perhaps, an infidel official, to obtain the money allowed for temporal support; but this is the "recognized law" in France, and has been for about a century.

And yet, prelate and curé understand, that a word uttered by either against "the powers that be," no matter what the provocation, may result in the suppression of their stipend, or in worse consequences.

This however is the status, "pure and simple," of the relations of the hierarchy and clergy with the government of the Republic of France.

The officials of the latter hold the purse-strings from whence nearly a hundred of the hierarchy and forty thousand priests periodically receive a stated sum for their support.

Imagine such a state of things in America! Archbishop Corrigan's secretary prepares a voucher for a quarter's salary, which is signed by His Grace and taken to the sub-treasury—upon which, when in proper shape, the money for current expenses is paid.

In the same way, fancy Father Ducey, for instance, sending his sexton down to Wall street on quarter day with a voucher for his quarter's salary of \$75.00, with which he is expected to support himself for three months!!

So universally Catholic however are the people of France, that small as the stipend paid in each case may be, the aggregate for each year forms no inconsiderable sum.

During the first Empire the hierarchy numbered about fifty; and the clergy thirty thousand.

The annual *Budget du Clergé* averages, for the Church, about ten million francs; and for other creeds about one and one-half millions more.

Besides this, the sums expended annually during the same period for the restoration of cathedrals, churches, évêchés and presbyteries, was quite large; as the finest religious edifices in France were desecrated, and in some cases ruined, during the revolutionary epoch.

Serious complications affecting the hierarchy and clergy ensued during the later years of the first Empire, and after the restoration.

Bishops who had been living in exile returned and found their Sees, which in many cases they had never resigned, amalgamated with others and administered by prelates duly appointed through the Holy See; curés who had kept away from France, found on their return, their former parishes consolidated or otherwise occupied by incumbents in regular standing.

Neither bishops or priests, unfortunately, had the means, generally speaking, necessary for their daily support.

Such, briefly stated, was the status of ecclesiastical affairs on the return of the Bourbons, to say nothing about the complications, both religious and political, between France and Rome, which had drawn upon the head of the Emperor the malediction of the Church.

The religious spirit of the French people, which had become dormant, was recalled to vigorous life by the liberal policy of the government of Louis XVIII. towards the Catholic Church. There seems, also, to have been no limit to the liberality of the national

legislature in voting money for religious purposes. The same spirit seems to have prevailed in the departmental and municipal bodies throughout France.

On August 24, 1819, the Count Decazes reported to the king that the salaries of the hierarchy and clergy had been so augmented, "that not one of the thirty thousand recipients could be found who had not experienced the happy results of the presence of His Majesty among his people."

In the meantime aged bishops without sees,<sup>1</sup> venerable ecclesiastical dignitaries and priests without fixed positions, besides destitute religious, were assigned pensions requiring an annual outlay for this purpose of eleven million francs.

The Count further reported that the *Budget du Clergé* amounted to twenty-two million francs per annum, exclusive of eleven million francs expended annually for ecclesiastical pensions and twenty millions which had been capitalized to endow twenty-four hundred seminary bourses of four hundred francs each.

The Count also reported "that large as was the aggregate of the expenditures stated, it was doubled every year by the supplemental sums voted by the Councils General of the Departments in the respective Provinces; by the one thousand or more municipal bodies for additional compensation to curés and vicaires; as also for the purchase, construction, or repairs of religious edifices; by the revenues of fabriques; by legacies and donations authorized by the Government; and by the casual offerings of the faithful."

"The situation of the clergy," continues the count, "had been found deplorable; His Majesty had done all that was possible to alleviate their condition, while at the same time it would have been cruel to have done less."

Louis XVIII., desirous of signaling that year by a special mark of his bounty, had placed at the disposition of Count Decazes an extra million francs, to be distributed where most needed, but especially to such poor parishes as were unable to restore their churches and presbyteries.

It will be seen by the report of the minister, that the annual *Budget du Clergé* proper was thirty-four millions on the part of the government, and an equal sum voted by departments and municipal bodies, making a total from these sources of sixty-eight million francs expended for the Church in 1819.

Passing over the monarchical eras of Louis XVIII., Charles X., and Louis Philippe, during which the Church in France regained much of her former splendor, and assuming that the sums officially applied each year averaged fifty million francs; passing over, also,

---

<sup>1</sup> See vol. ii., *Quatre Concordats*, l'Abbé DePradt.



the years preceding the second Empire, a middle period of the latter is taken for comparison with the annual outlay, summarized, of 1810 and 1819, with the details of the outlay fixed upon for the *Budget des Cultes* in the year of the Republic 1890; this will show the working of the system with seventeen archbishops, fifty bishops, and forty thousand clergy of all classes :<sup>1</sup>

*Official Tables of the Expenditure of the Government of France for des Cultes, under the Empire in 1861 and the Republic in 1890.*

	SECOND EMPIRE. 1861.	REPUBLIC. 1890.
	Francs.	Francs.
Cost of Government administration, . . .	247,900	242,000
Travelling expenses of Missionaries, . . .		13,000
Ecclesiastical seminaries, . . . . .	1,044,200	None.
Salaries of Archbishops and Bishops, . . .	1,512,500	930,000
“ Vicars-General, . . . . .		497,546
“ Canons, . . . . .		785,336
“ Curés, . . . . .		4,421,400
Vicaires and Assistant Priests, . . . . .	35,444,200	31,929,358
Canons of St. Denis, . . . . .	199,500	None.
Ecclesiastical pensions, . . . . .	860,000	800,000
Furniture for Episcopal use, . . . . .		20,000
Rents “ “ “ . . . . .		11,023
Maintenance of edifices, . . . . .	3,728,000	1,600,000
“ “ cathedrals, . . . . .	900,000	355,000
“ “ churches and presbyteries, . . . . .	1,615,000	1,500,000
Total Catholic, including cost of adm'tration, . . .	f. 45,551,300	f. 43,104,663
Protestant Pastors, . . . . .	1,368,436	1,525,000
“ seminaries, . . . . .	110,000	26,500
“ churches, . . . . .		20,000
Israelite Rabbis, . . . . .	202,400	158,900
“ seminaries, . . . . .		22,000
“ synagogues, . . . . .		20,000
Mussulman, personal, . . . . .	857,200	166,490
“ temples, . . . . .		41,950
Grand total, . . . . .	f. 48,089,336	f. 45,085,503

Under Napoleon III., the official tables give a total expenditure for the Catholic Church :

	Francs.
By the state, of, . . . . .	45,551,300
Under the Republic, the budget for 1890, calls for, . . .	43,104,663
Difference, . . . . .	2,446,637

The loss of Alsace-Lorraine to France would probably affect

<sup>1</sup> The official tables have been kindly furnished the writer by Monsieur E. Breuwaert, Consul-General of France at Chicago.

this difference materially, while there has been an increased outlay in Algeria.

The notable changes in 1890 are as follows :

	Francs.
Suppression of seminary charges, . . . . .	1,044,200
Canons of St. Denis, . . . . .	199,500
Salaries of the hierarchy (less), . . . . .	582,900
Ecclesiastical pensions lapsed, . . . . .	60,000
Maintenance of cathedrals and churches (less), . . . . .	2,756,977
Reduced cost of government administration, . . . . .	5,900
	<hr/>
Reduction; . . . . .	4,649,477

There was an increased outlay for the salaries of curés and vicaires of 2,189,440 francs; also, for Lutheran pastors, of 156,564 francs; and 46,500 francs for Jewish seminaries and synagogues. There was a decreased outlay of 83,500 francs for Lutheran seminaries, and 43,500 francs for Jewish rabbis. Under Napoleon III., Mussulman mosques, temples, etc., in France and Algeria, cost 857,200 francs; while, in 1890, the sum to be expended is 208,440 francs.

While the official tables quoted above disclose the disbursements of the national government in the *Budget des Cultes*, there are no official tables available to show the sums voted in the respective arrondissements by the communal or municipal governments, and paid out of their local revenues, for the repairs of churches or to supplement the salaries of overworked curés or their assistants; such sums, in the aggregate, during the second Empire may have nearly equalled the total outlay of the national government; it is, however, highly probable that, under the Republic, where infidel influence is potent in many of the local councils, the aid extended in this manner does not exceed, in the aggregate, one-third of the national outlay; the discrepancy would, however, be supplied by the generosity of wealthy Catholics among the nobility and bourgeoisie. The estimate of the total outlay, officially made, for the Church in France, would not be complete if the municipal supplement was not included.

Neither does the budget for 1890 cover the total of national outlay; considerable sums are annually charged the department of fine arts for paintings and statues authorized by the government for cathedrals and churches—probably more for the encouragement of native artists than from religious motives.

The summaries of the national outlay charged up as the *Budget des Cultes* for 1861, show a total, for all creeds, of over forty-eight million francs, out of which forty-five and one half millions, including cost of administration, were for the Catholic Church, while

two and one-half millions were charged for Lutherans, Jews, and Musselmen.

During the present year, the fixed expenditure is limited to forty-five million francs, of which forty-three millions is for the Catholic Church, and two millions for Jews, Lutherans, and Mussulmen; the cost of administration inclusive for all.

These proportionate results corroborate the estimate given of the strength of Catholicism in France.

On a basis of thirty-eight millions population, the average share of each inhabitant of the Republic of tax for the national outlay for religion, this year, will be one franc and twenty-five centimes, or about twenty-five cents, and probably double that amount would cover national and municipal taxes for this purpose.

Estimating the number of families at nine millions, the average share of each family per year of the religious budget of the State and of municipalities would be ten francs or two dollars.

Reverting to the despoliation of the Church in 1789 of her properties yielding two hundred million francs per annum, this income, with interest at the end of twelve years, would make a capital of three billion francs, when the Concordat was signed, in 1801, and the Church restored to France.

The interest on this capital, at four per cent., say one hundred and twenty million francs per annum, and the two hundred million francs of revenue originally sequestered, would be the yearly sum due the Church by the government; this was the equity of the case of the Church *versus* France in 1801. The annual sums paid from the revenues of France, commencing with the Consular government under Napoleon, and continued to the present day, however large these may have been under the Bourbons, directly or indirectly to the Church, for whatever purpose, are comparatively small in proportion to the debt which the State actually owes the Church, and which is fast increasing with each year's deficit.

Could a compromise be made, and a fair amount per annum be agreed upon as a partial indemnity to be paid over to the fiscal agent of the hierarchy, for the support of the Church, she would be freed from the annoyances incidental to her present dependent position; the burdens of her ministry would be borne more equally; she would gradually come into closer contact with the laity, and her priesthood would soon learn to lean on them for her support.

---



## Scientific Chronicle.

### ELECTRO-MAGNETIC THEORY OF LIGHT.

#### ITS CONFIRMATION.—PART III.

ALTHOUGH the theory advanced by Maxwell, that light is but a form of electrical energy, was adopted by many eminent physicists, still it remained for about a quarter of a century without experimental verification. Such a confirmation would link together irrevocably two important branches of physical science and throw light on the obscure problem of the nature of electrical energy. To add this last link in the chain of the argument was the dream of experimenters, and while studying the views of the great physicist for this end, our notions of electricity underwent great changes and modifications, intricate phenomena were studied in a clearer light, and the new views were already highly developed, when Hertz came forward with the long looked for empirical confirmation. The existence of electrical oscillations was admitted for years, but Prof. Hertz showed how they might be detected and studied.

The period of a wave of light is, roughly speaking,  $10^{-15}$  of a second, and we know of no way of producing electrical oscillations having anything like this rapidity. Previous to Hertz's experiments the most rapid electrical oscillations experimented with were given by the discharge of a Leyden jar through a resistance, and they had a period of about  $10^{-6}$  of a second. Obviously, the proof of the identity of electrical and light radiations was to make electrical oscillations of the same rate as light waves, and determine whether they had the same properties. The electrical waves so far examined were not rapid enough, but theoretically a much shorter period could be obtained by conducting wires, forming an open circuit with small knobs for terminals. This is the form adopted by Hertz in his experiments to determine whether or not measurable oscillations were produced. The period in this case should be some hundred millionths of a second,  $10^{-8}$  as compared with  $10^{-15}$  for light.

To detect the electrical oscillations Hertz had recourse to the principle of resonance. The application of this principle in acoustics is familiar to the student of physics. There are myriads of vibrations around us in the air which produce no sensible impression upon us, but hold to the ear a shell or other hollow body and a confused hum is at once audible. This is due to the fact that the air in the shell has a natural rate of vibration in unison with some of the weak vibrations in the air around, and, taking them, strengthens them, and thus makes us conscious of motions of which we were ignorant. It is on this principle that musical sounds are analyzed, and most musical sounds which to us seem simple are proved to be compound. The musical instrument is sounded before a set of resonators consisting of a number of vessels of different capacities. The rate of vibration will be different for these different volumes, so that

the air in those vessels will be set in vibration, in which the volume is such that its natural rate of vibration corresponds to the sounds produced by the instrument. When a single note is sounded on a musical instrument it is found that the air in several of the resonators is set in motion, thus showing the existence of several rates of vibration, or of different notes in that which at first is regarded as simple. The vibrations of the different columns of air are made visible by transmitting them by means of a membrane to a current of gas. Burning this gas in front of a rotating mirror the pulsations in the gas are observed in the serrated band of light reflected from the mirror. A still more striking experiment to illustrate resonance is to take two tuning-forks of exactly the same pitch. Having mounted them on suitable resonance-boxes, place them some distance apart and sound one of them. The second will be set in vibration simply by the sound waves coming from the first. The first air-pulse to reach the distant fork starts it vibrating, and, as its rate is the same as that of the waves striking it, the second wave comes after a complete vibration, and at the right time to increase its motion. Such forks are said to be sympathetic, and by means of a circuit in sympathy, or in resonance with the waves started in the ether, Hertz detected and began to study them. To understand how these waves are started it is well to remember that when the electric charge along a conductor is in any way disturbed equilibrium is again reached only after a series of oscillations to and fro, which gradually decrease in amplitude and finally die out. This may be illustrated by the oscillations of a pendulum, or the surging backward and forward of water when the vessel holding it has been tilted. As in the case of the pendulum and of the water the time of oscillation is definite, so with electricity its period of oscillation is definite. When the charges on the opposite coatings of a Leyden jar are combined, waves are started whose period depends on the capacity and the self-induction of the circuit. The resistance to elastic force, and hence the rapidity of the vibrations when the jar is discharged, is increased by decreasing the capacity; and the greater the self-induction of the circuit through which the discharge takes place, the greater the time of oscillation of the discharge. This latter law is expressed in another way; the rush of the electricity from one coating to the other constitutes a current and sets up a magnetic field around the conductor. But, it takes time to build up this field, and hence the establishing of the field is a drag on the electricity, and the more intense the field the slower the rush of the electricity, and hence the longer the time of oscillation of the discharge.

Now, by a very simple device, Hertz produced waves in the surrounding space of such rapidity that they were short enough to be measured. He obtained this result by extending the rods attached to the secondary terminals of an ordinary induction coil and increasing their capacity by attaching two metal plates to the extremities. Under these conditions the charge between the terminals was oscillatory and its period could be calculated. This he called the generator or vibrator. The plates attached to the induction coil being charged, say one positively and the

other negatively, there will be a discharge across the gap separating them. But, as in all such cases, there will be an overdischarge of one of the plates, and hence there will follow immediately a discharge in the opposite direction, this discharging in alternate directions lasting through about a dozen vibrations; as the time of each vibration is about the one two-hundred-millionth of a second, it is clear that the whole discharge is over in less than a millionth of a second. But this action may be repeated several hundred times a second, depending on the frequency of the spark given by the induction coil.

To detect the vibrations thus started, Hertz used his sympathetic resonator, a very simple device. It consisted of a loop of wire of such length that the period of electrical vibration in it was the same as in the vibrator. There was a small gap in the resonator, and when the length of the resonator was adjusted so that it was in unison with the generator a spark crossed the gap in the former every time there was a discharge in the latter. The necessity of adjusting the size of the resonator in order to get the spark shows that the forces acting are periodic. Equipped with this apparatus, Hertz discovered that his tuned receiver not only responded to the impulses of the vibrator, but that the sparks in the former showed a series of maximum and minimum values, recurring in periodic order as the receiver was carried away from the centre of electrical disturbance.

The fact that the conducting material of which the resonator is made has no effect upon the spark, shows that the spark is due to a series of oscillations induced in the circuit, and hence are dependent on self-induction and capacities which are time constants. Again, when the knobs of the induction coil are so far apart that no spark passes, the spark disappears in the resonator, thus showing that the electricity in the latter is due not to the charging current in the primary, but to the discharges, and hence to the oscillations started by these discharges. This is further established; for if the cause is really due to oscillations of the character of regular vibrations, then an oscillatory current of definite period would exert a greater inductive effect upon one of equal period than upon one differing from it. So, when we have two such currents, their mutual effect should be diminished by altering the capacity or the co-efficient of self-induction of one of them; as this change would alter its period. This is what actually occurred in Hertz's experiments on changing the capacity of either the generating or receiving circuit, while the other remained constant. Hence it is clearly established that the phenomena noted were due to oscillations in the generator of a period approximately equal to that calculated, namely, the one hundred-millionth of a second.

To further prove the oscillatory character of the induced currents, Hertz surmised the existence of nodes or points of zero disturbance. If a string one yard long be tightly stretched between two supports, and then plucked, it will begin to vibrate as a whole. If it be damped at one-third its length the remaining two-thirds will not vibrate as a whole, but will divide into two parts, the point of division remaining at rest. This point is called a node. If we touch a vibrating string at a node



the vibrations will not be destroyed. So Hertz determined to test his resonator in a similar way to determine whether the current in it was oscillatory or not. While it was in unison with the generating circle the gap was adjusted so that the spark could just pass. Then a sphere was placed against the wire, and, moving it to different points, it was found that the sparks ceased, except when the sphere was in the middle, thus showing that the centre was a nodal point. Hertz proved that we could have electrical oscillations with one or two nodes, but he considered it doubtful whether we could produce the higher electrical overtones analogous to the overtones of a musical note.

Hertz studied the mode of propagation of electrical waves in wires, and found the nodes and loops characteristic of all other wave propagation. For, on moving his resonator along the wire carrying the electrical oscillations, it gave maximum and minimum effects at regular intervals. Having thus established experimentally the existence of electrical oscillations, the method of detecting them was directed to a study of their properties.

First placing the generating induction coil in the centre of a large room, it was found that no matter what part of the room the resonator was taken to it gave the sparks, showing that the electrical waves are sent out in all directions. This is a simple but beautiful experiment, and it is peculiarly striking to watch how the loop of wire, which you carry around the room and which is entirely disconnected from the induction coil which stands in the centre of the room, gives across the small gap left in it a series of electric sparks in perfect tune with the sparks at the induction coil. It never fails once to respond if it has been perfectly adjusted. In fact, you may walk into an adjoining room and close the door after you, and the intervening brick or plaster wall will not break the spell; the little resonator is as faithful as before in responding to every call of the induction coil. A metal shield will alone protect it from the influence of the generator. Thus Hertz showed that some substances transmit the electrical oscillations while others do not, just as some substances transmit light while others are opaque.

As both theory and experience show that conductors are good reflectors of electro-magnetic waves, Hertz constructed two large parabolic reflectors of sheet-metal, and placing the generator in the focus of one of them, and the resonator in the focus of the other, the resonance phenomena were obtained at a greater distance than without them. By this means it was proved that these electric oscillations are reflected according to the laws governing the reflection of light. Hence, conductors bear about the same relation to electric oscillations that opaque bodies do to light.

The next step was to determine whether dielectrics acted towards these same oscillations as transparent bodies do towards light. When a ray of light passes from one transparent medium to another of different density, it is bent out of its course, or refracted. By interposing a large pitch prism in the path of the electrical waves as they travelled from one mirror to the other, Hertz found that the resonator did not respond

in its old position, but had to be moved to a new position before the sparks were obtained, thus showing clearly that the waves were refracted in passing through the pitch. The index of refraction for the pitch was determined to be 1.7, or, electro-magnetic waves travel through the air 1.7 times as fast as through pitch. But, as in the case of light, the wave theory was definitely established by interference-phenomena, so, in this case, the effects were proved to be due to wave motion by interference-phenomena. Waves in any medium may combine so as to strengthen, or so as to neutralize each other's effect, the maximum strengthening occurring when the crest of a wave in one set corresponds with the crest of a wave in the other, there being complete neutralization when the crest in one case corresponds with the hollow of an equal wave.

Preparing one wall of the room as a reflector by covering it with zinc, he started his vibrator, and on carrying the resonator to different positions between the vibrator and the reflector, he found that sparks were obtained only at fixed positions, which were at regular intervals from each other with definite air spaces between. This is exactly the effect of interference. If sound-waves interfere in this way, we have points of maximum and minimum motion corresponding with points of least and greatest condensation and rarefaction. In a single wave these points are called nodes and loops. Now, the nodal point in the case of electric oscillations is the point at which the changes in magnetic induction will be a maximum, and the changes in electric displacement a minimum, while a loop is a point of no magnetic induction, while the electrical displacement will be a maximum. Hertz, by properly adjusting his resonator, found, first, the positions of maximum and minimum electric displacement, and then those of maximum and minimum magnetic intensity. He found that the points of greatest electrical displacement alternated, at regular intervals, with the points of greatest magnetic intensity, thus constituting true electrical nodes and loops, and showing the phenomenon to be a true interference-phenomenon, depending on wave motion.

From this same experiment the wave length was determined, and deducing from the form and dimensions of the generator the time of vibration, the velocity of propagation was readily deduced. As obtained, it was approximately that of light, and the difference between the two could be readily due to the fact that the period of vibration of the apparatus cannot be calculated with accuracy.

The similarity in properties was further established by showing that the electrical oscillations can be polarized; wire screens effecting changes in the oscillations transmitted in the same way as tourmaline polarizes light. By these, and other experiments, electro-magnetic waves were proved to have properties similar to light waves, and to be governed by the same laws. They are reflected as light, refracted as light, give interference-phenomena as light does, are diffracted as light, polarized as light, and travel with the same velocity as light, and outward in all directions from the source of disturbance, as light from a luminous centre. The points of agreement are too many and too important to

ignore the theory, in confirmation of which they have been experimentally determined. All concede, that as far as we can see at present, these experiments of Hertz, and numerous others made since by other experimenters, fully confirm Maxwell's theory that light is an electrical phenomenon, and light waves are electro-magnetic waves. They are both ether waves. What, then, is the difference between light waves and the electro-magnetic waves sent out from Hertz's vibrator? The only difference is one solely of wave length. The electro-magnetic waves thus far manufactured are too long to affect the eye. If a means be devised to so shorten them that they will have the length of a wave of light, then the vibrator will become a luminous centre, and we will have a means of generating light waves directly without the useless expenditure of energy, in the shape of heat, which accompanies our present methods. We will then be no longer in the awkward position thus graphically described by Professor Lodge: "It is as though, in order to sound some little shrill octave of pipes in an organ, we were obliged to depress every key and every pedal, and to blow a young hurricane."

---

### THE SPECTROSCOPE IN ASTRONOMY.

ALMOST every one is familiar with the history of the spectroscope in revealing the materials of which the heavenly bodies are made up. But this is only a small portion of the work done by the spectroscope, now an indispensable instrument in every well-equipped observatory. It enables us to measure the invisible without making it visible, and its accuracy in this respect is daily increasing with every new development in the science of spectroscopy. The first revelation of the spectroscope was the nature of the substances of which the sun and stars are composed; then, their condition, whether gaseous or solid, of high or low temperature; but it now presents itself as a measurer of distances and of masses. In this last connection the determination of the rate at which a star is moving away from or towards the earth is an interesting point.

There are in the heavens what are known as double stars. Their distances apart along the line of sight may be very great, but when both stars are projected on the celestial sphere, the line joining them subtends such a small angle at the eye of the observer that they coincide and appear to the unaided eye as one star. Before the invention of the telescope, the principal star in Capricornus was known as a double star. But the telescope shows numerous double stars so close together that they can be separated only by high magnifying powers. Over ten thousand such stars are now known, and their number is continually increasing. But the spectroscope has told us of a double star so close that no telescope will separate the components, although each is bright enough to be seen by the naked eye.

To understand this, it is necessary to know how the spectroscope tells its story. Although the rainbow was the first solar spectrum ever be-



held, still Newton was the first to imitate the rainbow and analyze light by means of a prism. When a beam of light falls upon a glass prism, it is split up into its constituents, and instead of the original white beam which fell upon the prism we have, when it emerges on the opposite side, a band of colored light, red on one end, violet at the other, intermediate colors filling in the space between the two. The cause of this dispersion, as it is called, is that the rate of vibration is different for each of these constituents, and when the light enters the dense glass from the air, those colors which have the shortest wave length will be retarded most on their journey through the prism, and hence bent most out of their course. Hence the colors arrange themselves in the order of their wave lengths. It is on this luminous scroll that the sun and stars write their history, and much of it we are already able to decipher. Although Newton made many experiments on the spectrum, still, for over a century, physicists had no notion of its true appearance. This was due to the fact that Newton had used in all his experiments a cylindrical beam of light. Such a method, as is evident on trial, does not give a pure spectrum, for the colors overlap. It was in 1802, that Wollaston changed the circular opening in the shutter for a narrow slit, and first obtained a pure spectrum, in which each color had its own distinct place in the spectrum. With this change, Wollaston examined the solar spectrum, and found that it was not, as Newton had supposed, one continuous band of light, an unbroken rainbow, but that it was really broken by a series of fine black lines crossing it at right angles to its length. In 1814, Fraunhofer mapped out these lines to the number of 576. Hence, they bear his name, and the principal lines are designated by the letters, A, B, C, etc. At first, these dark lines were regarded as the boundary lines of the pure colors of the spectrum. But it was found that in the continuous spectrum of an incandescent non-volatile substance there were no dark lines. Therefore, there must be some special cause for their appearance in the solar spectrum. But their true significance was not pointed out until 1859, when Kirchhoff identified the D lines as due to sodium vapor in the atmosphere of the sun. By coloring the flame of a Bunsen burner yellow, which is done by putting a small amount of salt in it, it gave in the spectroscope not a continuous band of different colored lights, but two yellow lines near the D lines of the solar spectrum. It was further shown that, if, while an observer was viewing a continuous spectrum, the yellow sodium flame was placed before the slit, two dark bands were observed in the position of the D lines of the solar spectrum, and exactly where the yellow lines of the sodium flame would appear if that light alone was in front of the slit. Thus it was apparent that the yellow sodium flame cut off certain rays of light, and hence their place in the spectrum was blank, and, moreover, that it intercepted just those rays of light which it was capable of emitting. Hence, Kirchhoff justly concluded that the D lines of the solar spectrum were sodium lines, due to the fact that vapor of sodium in the sun's atmosphere absorbed light of that particular refrangibility, which was emitted by the incandescent core. Other lines of the spectrum of the sun and stars

were made the object of careful study, and we soon became familiar with the materials out of which these distant heavenly bodies are built.

But these dark lines also tell us the rate at which these apparently fixed bodies, the stars, are travelling through space, and reveal unresolvable double stars. It is only of late that this branch of stellar spectroscopy is receiving the attention it deserves, and it promises to repay well the labor devoted to it. We will glance briefly at the principles involved in the work, and at the accuracy of the results.

If we examine, spectroscopically, the light from a fixed star, we find that the spectrum is crossed by five black lines, due to the absorption of certain rays in the star's own atmosphere. These lines are in a fixed position in the spectrum of the star, and if the earth and the star remain the same distance apart there is no reason for these lines changing their position in the spectroscope. If, however, the star approach us we expect a change in accordance with Doppler's principle. In the case of a sound, for example, we know that the pitch depends on the rate of vibration. If a source of sound is at a constant distance from the observer, any definite note from that source will retain its pitch. But should the observer remain at rest, and the source of sound move rapidly towards him, giving out the sound at the same time, he will perceive the note to rise in pitch. This change in pitch is due to the fact that although the sound does not change, still, as the source is approaching the observer, a greater number of vibrations will be received in a second than if it was stationary. Now, as the pitch depends on the number of vibrations in a second, and as a greater number of vibrations reach the ear of the observer on account of the approach of the source of the sound, the sensation will respond to this increased rate of vibration, and the pitch will be higher. This principle applies to all wave-motion, and hence to the light from a star, so that when a star is moving towards the earth the light which gives that portion of the spectrum on either side of any dark band, will, practically, on account of the forward motion of the planet, have a higher rate, and, as the position to which light is refracted depends on its rate, they will be moved towards the violet end of the spectrum. Since the dark line indicates rates between these two which are missing in the spectrum, it will also move towards the violet end. This does not mean that one portion of the spectrum changes position, the other remaining constant, but as all kinds of light travel with the same velocity, the whole spectrum will be moved towards the side at which the violet appears. Now, this is what should happen on the supposition that the source of light approaches us. The lines will move in the opposite direction when the source of light recedes from us, as the shrill note from the whistle of a locomotive rises in pitch as the engine approaches us, and falls as it moves away from us. A motion as described is actually observed in the lines of the spectra of some of the stars, and it can be explained only on the supposition of the motion of the star relative to the earth. By measuring the amount of displacement of any one of the dark lines, the velocity at which the star is moving can be easily determined. The difficult point to be determined is the exact

amount by which the line has been displaced. In order to spread out the spectrum as much as possible, and thus give the best opportunity for measuring the displacement, several prisms must be used. Now, this means diminution in brightness of the spectrum, which can be ill-afforded when the supply of light is already niggardly. Therefore, it is not surprising that this branch should, at present, be undergoing vigorous development, since our large telescopes are capable of collecting so much more of the star's light, and thus permit of this greater dispersion. Another reason, which accounts for the present activity in this line of research, is the development in photography, and the success with which it can be applied to obtaining permanent records of celestial phenomena which may afterwards be studied at leisure.

This study of the spectrum is one of the three lines of research prosecuted with such vigor at Mount Hamilton, with the great Lick telescope. This part of the work is under the care of Mr. James E. Keeler; and some of the observations made by Mr. Keeler give us a good idea of the accuracy of the method. The able director of the observatory, Prof. Ed. S. Holden, writing to the *New York Herald*, about two months ago, gives the results of the experiments.

In the month of August last, Mr. Keeler, using the spectroscope, determined by the method above referred to the velocity of the planet Venus. The figures he obtained, were 7.3, 8.3, 9.3, 7.5 miles per second. The motion of the planet can be calculated from its orbit, and hence we have a means of testing the accuracy of the spectroscope-work. This latter method gave the real motion, at the time of the above observation, as 8.1, 8.2, 8.2, 8.2. The error of the spectroscope, then, amounted to 0.8, 0.1, 1.1, 0.7 mile per second. That is, we can be sure of the motion of a planet or star, as determined from the spectroscope, within less than one mile per second. This method has been applied to some stars, and the fact of their motion relative to the earth, as well as the velocity of this motion, determined. The only other way in which we could arrive at this conclusion would be by observing the change in the apparent disk of these stars, but, these heavenly bodies are so far away from us that, viewed in our most powerful telescopes, they remain points of light, and hence this method is impossible. The spectroscope also reveals the motion of some of the nebulae relatively to the earth.

The way in which the spectroscope tells of double stars, so close that no telescope may resolve them, can be gathered from the remarkable discovery lately made by Professor Pickering, of Harvard. From photographs of the spectrum of the star Mizar, taken at the Harvard observatory, it was noticed that some of the dark lines changed at intervals. Thus, in the photographs taken on March 29, 1887, on May 17, 1889, and on August 27 and 28, 1889, the K line was clearly doubled. On other dates it was hazy, as if the components were slightly separated, while on other dates it was well defined and single. Examination of the series of photographs revealed a periodicity in this doubling, so that it could be predicted. A prediction of the doubling was made for December 8, 1889, and on that date it was confirmed by each of three



photographs. It is also certain, that several of the other lines are also double when the Kline is double. On examination, it was seen that the duplication occurred every fifty-two days. Professor Pickering concludes that the star is double; and several interesting results have been worked out in support of the hypothesis. Manifestly, we have here not one but two spectra from stars so close that they are superimposed. That is, Mizar is a binary star, the two components revolving around a common centre in twice the period of the duplication of the lines. When one is approaching and the other receding from the earth, the lines will be separated by the difference of their relative motions. When one is most distant and the other nearest, neither will have any motion relatively to the earth, and the lines will coincide. During the next semi-revolution the lines will be again displaced, but also transposed, as the one which was receding before is now approaching. At the end of this half-revolution they will be at rest, relatively to the earth, and the lines will coincide again. Therefore, there are two doublings of the lines in one revolution, and, as the doubling occurs every 52 days, the period of revolution must be 104 days. Another deduction from the observations was, that the two components are of the same brightness, as the lines were equally black; hence it is inferred that they are nearly equal in mass. The motion indicated by the displacement is 100 miles per second, but this is twice the actual motion, as the displacement is due to the opposite motion of both. Regarding one of them as stationary and the other in motion in a circular orbit, the circumference of this orbit would be 900,000,000 miles, and the distance apart of the two stars 143,000,000 miles. This is about the distance of Mars from the sun. But the period of Mars is 687 days. Hence the motion of our star is over six times as rapid. But the mass must be increased to preserve a circular orbit by the square of this ratio. That is, the mass of the two stars is about 40 times the mass of our sun. In other words, two stars, each twenty times the size of the sun revolving around each other at the distance of Mars from the sun, would give the phenomena observed in the spectrum of Mizar.

These points, then, give us some idea of the revelations made by the spectroscope, and the results we may expect in the lines of research to which it is now being applied.

---

#### ELECTRICITY FOR TIME OF WAR.

MANY devices have been proposed to show the adaptability of electricity as an indispensable agent in modern warfare, and new ones are daily brought to light. Some are practicable and efficient; others are impracticable or inefficient. Some have been discarded, and some now in use may be abandoned, but some have undoubtedly come to stay, and prove that in any future war electricity will play an important part.

One of the earliest applications of electricity was to the submarine mine, so useful in harbor defence. This mine consists of a number of water-tight tanks, which are anchored in different parts of the harbor, along the line which vessels entering the harbor must take. These tanks contain charges of gun-cotton, varying from 100 to 1000 pounds. They are all connected by cables with an operating-room on the shore, where the batteries and measuring instruments are kept. Floating above each tank is an automatic circuit-closer, consisting of contact points, which are closed by the shock from the passing vessel. This closing of the circuit works a relay in the operating-room, which throws in the circuit a current strong enough to heat the fine platinum wire in the fuse. This ignites the fulminate of mercury. The fulminate detonates a primer of dry gun-cotton, which in turn detonates the full charge of damp gun-cotton in the submerged tank. All this takes place in an instant, so the offending vessel ignites the fuse for its own destruction.

A similar plan is carried out in the subterranean mine destined to defend the approaches to a fort or other available position. The torpedoes are buried in the ground, and may be discharged either automatically by the soldiers as they walk over them, or by an observer in the fort who can view the approaches, and who knows the position of the mines. When the besiegers are over a mine he can send the current, and one can easily imagine the injury to, as well as the consternation in, the approaching ranks.

In harbor defense, it is not sufficient to wait until the enemy is in the harbor, but there must be some means of meeting him half-way. For this purpose we have the dirigible self-moving torpedo. This is still in the experimental stage, but good results have been obtained. In this torpedo, electricity is both the motive and directing power. In the Sims-Edison type, the electricity is transmitted by a wire which unrolls from a bobbin on the shore as the torpedo moves out. In the Halpine-Savage type, the source of energy is carried along in the shape of storage batteries. When this torpedo strikes the vessel its motion is reversed, and it returns, leaving the explosive behind. This later is exploded after it has gone a certain distance, determined by the length of a chain attached to it. The use of these dirigible torpedoes in a naval conflict is apparent, and they undoubtedly give electricity a new field in warfare.

On land, the telegraph is indispensable in marshalling large armies to the scene of battle that by their concerted action victory may be more secure. But, on the field of battle itself, temporary telegraph and telephone lines are necessary for the transmission of an order, on the prompt reception of which victory will depend.

On sea, our war ships are not only lighted by electricity, but in the latest and best equipped, the ammunition is hoisted on deck by means of electricity, as on board the *Atlanta*, and the guns are trained by means of electricity, as on board the *Chicago*. By means of the electric hoist on the *Atlanta*, a 250-pound shell can be raised on deck in nine and a half seconds. The motor used is specially designed for this work, and the speed of the hoist is entirely under the control of the operator. The

speed at which the operator turns a wheel determines the speed of the hoist. If the operator stops the hoist stops. So, if the operator should be killed or the motor injured during an engagement, the shell would remain in whatever position it might be in at the time. Thus the danger resulting from forcing the shell up against the deck, or letting it fall back in the vessel is avoided.

By means of the electric training apparatus on the Chicago, one of the eight-inch guns is absolutely under the control of the gun captain. Ordinarily he has to tell some one which way and how far the gun is to removed, but now he can move the gun himself just where he wishes, that is, he moves a lever in the direction required and the electric motor moves the gun in the same direction. When it is in position he stops the lever, and the motor stops. Thus mistakes arising from the misunderstanding of orders are avoided. By this means the gun can be adjusted rapidly and with the greatest accuracy.

But even more can be done by electricity. The gun can be discharged by its agency, and its efficiency increased by the increased rapidity of discharge. An order by the government to construct a motor which could be attached to the barrel of the gun and would move with it, which would be out of the line of sight, and which would not interfere with the elevation and depression of the gun, and which could be worked by the electric-lighting plants on the ship, has brought out a motor fulfilling these conditions, and which makes the Gatling gun automatic. Ordinarily, two men were required to manipulate this gun, one to direct it and the other to turn the crank which works the breech mechanism. This causes the barrels to rotate. There are ten barrels, and, as they are discharged successively, there are ten shots each revolution. By the application of the motor a rate of 1500 discharges per minute has been reached, which is much higher than will ever be required.

This improvement is significant when we recall the fact that the opinion is growing that these smaller guns will be much more effective in actual engagement than those enormous guns which so weight large war vessels as to make them unwieldy, and whose seafaring qualities in time of conflict is an experiment to be yet made. Opinion gives the preference to the smaller guns for utility in repelling attacks and for general fighting at close quarters, where the quick-firing gun will be effective in damaging armor and in injuring the enemy's large guns, which, on account of their size, are necessarily much exposed.

This is a brief account of some of the applications ; many others might be mentioned, but it gives an idea of the place of electricity in modern warfare. Hence, the suggestion of the establishment of a corps of electrical engineers in connection with the army is favorably received by those who understand best the situation. In time of war and in the heat of the battle, emergencies will arise in the application of this agent which will require the experience of trained electricians. While such a body of experts, studying the possibilities of electricity with a view to this special application, would undoubtedly devise new methods, increasing manifold its utility as an element in warfare.



## NIAGARA FALLS POWER COMPANY.

FOR years the engineer has watched regretfully the lavish waste of energy at Niagara Falls, and sighed for some means of harnessing it to our machinery that it might be turned to account for the practical side of life. It is true, that for a long time a canal about three-quarters of a mile long has been in operation, working about twelve mills, principally flour mills. But the great desire to utilize the falls on a large scale is about to be realized. The great obstacle has been the difficulty of cutting through the hard limestone rock a tunnel of adequate dimensions.

A company known as the "Niagara Falls Power Company" has been formed, with capital sufficient to carry on the work, which has already been begun. The plan is to make a tunnel, horse-shoe shape in cross-section, 160 feet below ground. The tunnel will run from water-level below the falls back to about one mile above the falls. It runs parallel with the river at about 400 feet from it. The area of the cross-section is 490 square feet. This is sufficient to discharge the water from wheels furnishing 120,000 horse-power.

The water is brought from the river by means of surface canals to the wheel-pits, which are sunk below the level of the canals. The tunnel will serve as a tail-race for these wheel-pits. The company intends placing turbines in some of the pits, in order to furnish power by cable, pneumatic tubes, or electricity. They will also lease privileges to customers to make their own pits, and furnish their own wheels and connections. Although there is a fall of 160 feet from the canals to the tunnel, still they intend to use only 120 feet fall, leaving the remaining 40 feet for free discharge of the water. It is calculated that this plan of utilizing the water of the falls will take from the river only 4 per cent. of the water now flowing over the falls. Hence, there will always be an abundant supply, and the stopping of the mills for want of water will be unheard of. It is expected that the first section will be ready for use in the early part of 1892. As the mills are a distance above the falls, and back from the river, the natural beauty of the falls will not be impaired, and will still attract the usual number of sight-seers. With such a source of cheap power, Niagara should become a flourishing manufacturing centre.

---

## STEAMERS PROPELLED BY WATER-JET.

MANY marine engineers have given attention to this mode of propelling vessels, and some practical results have been attained. They have been encouraged in their work by the hope of giving to the world a method of propulsion which, without sacrificing any of the good points in our present highly-developed system, would remove its defects. We are aware that our great ocean steamers, when they are under full headway, cannot be brought readily to rest, or turned with that rapidity

required when a collision is imminent. In rough seas, the vessel is tossed and the screw comes out of the water with the full force of the steam applied to it, and not meeting the resistance of the water, it races, jarring and weakening the machinery, in many cases leading ultimately to break-downs. The breaking of the main-shaft is of frequent occurrence, and seems to be the result of strains and flexures due to varying load and movements of the hull of the vessel.

The mode of propulsion proposed to obviate these difficulties is the water-jet. Powerful pumps, worked by the engines of the vessel, discharge a jet of water in the direction opposite to that in which it is intended to drive the vessel. At least two jets are to be used, and placed one on each side of the hull, near the midships. These jets may be worked either by the same pump or by separate pumps. Of course, the number of jets may be increased on large vessels. The first great advantage claimed for this system is that of safety. It conduces to safety because there is no screw to race or shaft to break. In case of fire, the pumping capacity, which is the main thing in this system, is capable of extinguishing any fire. Again, in case of a leak, this same power, which is inadequate in our present ocean steamers, is at hand to prevent sinking and at the same time to propel the vessel forward by the very water it pumps out of it. The pumping power may be as high as 2000 tons per minute. Such a pumping capacity would have saved many a vessel that has been lost from being inadequately supplied in this respect. By this system the vessel is completely in the hands of the officer on deck, who, by a movement of the hand, can instantly reverse or stop, without the necessity of transmitting orders to others. While the vessel is under full headway, the officer can reverse the direction in which the water is discharged, thus applying, instantly, the whole force of propulsion opposite to that in which the vessel is going, bringing it to rest, as has been done, in some trials, within its own length. Should the rudder be disabled, the vessel may be steered by regulating the discharge on the sides; and during trials, vessels propelled in this way have been turned on their centre. This is effected by using the discharge on one side only.

With all these good qualities, it is yet doubtful whether this will be adopted as the sole mode of propulsion for our vessels. The objection to it is, that it does not give the required speed. A gun-boat, 160 feet long, and 32 feet beam, of 1300 tons displacement, with an indicated horse-power of 750, and discharging 350 tons of water per minute, has reached a speed of 10 knots per hour. When the experiment has been tried on a large scale we will be able to judge better of the speed that can be attained. Although it may never become the sole mode of propulsion, still this method is a useful adjunct on our large vessels as furnishing a ready means of stopping and turning, and supplying a large pumping capacity. Its utility on our men-of-war, in time of actual engagement, cannot be overestimated, since it furnishes such a ready control over the movements of the vessel.

One of the most interesting applications of this method of propulsion

is in the English life-boat, Duke of Northumberland. After a careful consideration of the best plans for such a boat, paddle-wheels were rejected, because she could be so easily disabled by the slightest obstacle from a wreck. The screw was also rejected as such a boat must be used in rough seas where the screw must be out of the water most of the time and hence useless. Hence the water-jet was adopted. The engines work a turbine which gives the water-power. The vessel was subjected to some very severe tests. Going at full speed she made, with her rudder, half a circle in 35 seconds, and a complete circle in 52 seconds. Going slowly, and using both rudder and water-jet to turn her, she made a full circle in 40 seconds. The water-jets brought her to a dead-stop in 32 seconds, and she regained full headway in 4 seconds. She was steered by means of the jets as easily as with the rudder. Her ordinary speed is 9 knots an hour.

In this kind of propulsion there has been much dispute about the size of the water-jet. Some claim that small jets under pressure will give better results than large jets. To prove this, a boat has been constructed at Brooklyn and furnished with small jets to be worked at high pressure. Phenomenal speed was predicted for this vessel. She has made her trial trip, but, as far as we know, no data as to speed have been published. So far, the utility of the water-jet system, as a supplementary mode of propulsion, seems to have been established as well as its superiority as sole power in certain particular cases, but its future for large vessels will depend on experiments made on a large scale.

---

### THE GREAT FORTY-INCH LENS.

THE glass for part of the objective, to be placed in the telescope of the new observatory of Southern California, has been received by the Clarkes of Cambridgeport, Mass. They have the contract of making the great objective, and when both its parts are completed and ready to be placed in the telescope it will probably be worth \$65,000. The diameter of the lens will be forty inches, or four inches more than that of the great Lick lens. The length of the new telescope will be about sixty feet. The Lick telescope is fifty-seven feet focal length. The new observatory will be on Wilson's Peak in the Sierra Madre range of mountains, about fifteen miles from Los Angeles. Mt. Hamilton, on which the Lick observatory stands, is 4209 feet above sea level; Wilson's Peak is 6000; so the new observatory will stand nearly 2000 feet higher. The great advantage of these high elevations is a clearer sky, and, as a consequence, the greater number of nights on which observations can be made during the year. These large lenses have the advantage of collecting a greater amount of light from the heavenly body, and hence it may be examined under a higher magnifying power. They are especially useful for three kinds of work—to examine the features of a planet, to photograph star clusters and nebulae, and to condense the large amount of light necessary for spectroscopic work.



## THE PORTELECTRIC RAILROAD.

It is known that, if a hollow cylinder be surrounded by a coil of wire and an electric current be passed through the coil, a piece of iron held in front of the central opening in the coil will be sucked into the centre of the solenoid. If, at the moment of entering the solenoid, the current be cut off from the coil, the piece of iron, on account of its momentum, will move on some distance. A railroad for the transportation of mail and express packages has been designed on this principle. In the *Chronicle* for October, 1889, we described the Weems railway, designed for the same object. About the same time a model of this Portelectric system of transportation, as it is called, was on exhibition in the Old South Church, Boston. Now an experimental track has been constructed in the suburbs of Boston, near Howard Street Station, on the New York and New England Railroad. The track is 3000 feet long, oval in shape, and includes two curves of different radii, some straight level sections and two grades, one of 8 per cent. and another of 11 per cent. Here the system was subjected to tests with a view to the requirements of commercial service. The track consists of large solenoids placed six feet apart on top of a frame work, with one rail running through the lower part and another through the upper part of the solenoids. The car is an iron cylinder ten inches in diameter and twelve feet long. It runs along the lower rail on two wheels, and has two guide-wheels to run on the rail above the car. As the coils have an internal diameter of eleven inches the car passes through them freely. The lower rail is connected with one terminal of the dynamo, and the other terminal is connected with a wire parallel with the lower rail. This wire is connected with the six-foot sections of the upper track. The car completes the circuit between the rails through the solenoid ahead of it, and is drawn forward into the coil. When midway through the coil this circuit is broken and a new one made with the next solenoid, which in its turn draws the car ahead. There were difficulties in adapting the car to the compound of grade and curve. But it was driven around the 3000 feet track in one and a half minutes. Its speed reached 45 feet per second. The highest acceleration was  $3\frac{1}{2}$  feet per second, which, if kept up for a minute, would give a speed of about two miles per minute. This could no doubt be reached on a straight level track, but not on the present one, with its complication of curve and grade.

Prof. A. E. Dolbear, the electrician of the company, feels confident that it will be a commercial success.

---

## Book Notices.

LES CRITÈRES THÉOLOGIQUES. Par le Chanoine Salvatore di Bartolo, Docteur Romain en Théologie et le Droit Canonique. Ouvrage traduit de l'Italien. Paris, Berche et Tralin, 1889.

A French translation of *I Criteri Teologici* of Canon Salvator di Bartolo, of Palermo. Truly, a most remarkable little work, and one we are sure will give rise to many and most important controversies. It is positively startling in some of its conclusions; and yet, it comes to us indorsed by many of the greatest authorities in the Church—cardinals, bishops, professors in universities, and doctors in theology. Cardinal Manning writes to the author: "I hope your clear and pacific reasonings will act efficaciously on those who differ from us in faith." Cardinal Gibbons writes: "It cannot fail to strengthen faith and to remove prejudices."

Every letter, and there are many, praises the author highly, and approves of the work cordially, although some criticise this or that proposition. The book is full of reverence for the teaching authority of the Church and the Roman Pontiff, yet, its keynote is the right of human reason in the domain of theology as well as that of science, and the whole work is a vindication of that right. We will give a summary of this notable work. It begins with twenty propositions on the province of reason in Catholic teaching (33 pages). Then follow the ten Criteria, developed in positive and negative propositions: 1. The teaching Church; eight positive and eleven negative propositions. 2. General Councils; six positive and eight negative propositions. 3. Roman Pontiff, speaking *ex cathedra*; five positive and fourteen negative propositions. 4. Universal belief; four positive and four negative propositions. 5. Positive teaching—the symbols of faith; dogmatic teaching; the teaching of the doctors and of theologians; four positive and seven negative propositions. 6. Negative teaching; condemnation of heresy; two positive and nine negative propositions. 7. Doctrinal precepts; six positive and five negative propositions. 8. Tradition; ten positive and eleven negative propositions. 9. Holy Scripture; Canon of Scripture; one positive and one negative proposition; original texts, three positive propositions; the Vulgate, two positive and five negative propositions; inspiration of scripture, three positive and four negative propositions; sense of Scripture, nine positive and thirteen negative propositions. 10. Church, tradition, Scripture, three propositions. Then follows an appendix on legislation of the Church, eight positive and three negative propositions. The author concludes by making some suggestions (328 duodecimo pages).

To illustrate: We take one of his longest propositions, from the third criterion, the Roman Pontiff speaking *ex cathedra*. The fourth negative proposition is thus stated: "Pontifical decrees, even those that are authentic, and collections of condemned propositions, even when such collections have been made by order of the Pope, do not constitute a proposition made to the Church in the form of decrees *ex cathedra*." "We speak here of decrees contained in the Corpus of canon law, which gives them undoubted authenticity. Now, every decree is not a proposition made to the Church of an *ex cathedra* teaching, because the Roman Pontiffs are men, using their intelligence, and that intelligence has its opinions, probabilities, and conjectures. We must except, however, the case where the exercise of the gift of infallibility is necessary for the

good of the faithful. The sovereign Pontiffs themselves prove the truth of our proposition in their own decrees, and we ought not to demand more than they do." He confirms this assertion by the words of Melchior Cano and Ballerini. Coming down to the *Syllabus* of Pius IX., he says: "The Sovereign Pontiff, Pius IX., in 1864, had published in the form of an *Index* a collection of all the errors he had condemned during his pontificate; now, according to the explained criterion, we do not hold that the *Syllabus* is an infallible document, *per se*. . . . The Pope never declared the document infallible. He gives it a name which expresses its real value—a *Table* of condemned propositions. Now, if the decree of Gratian . . . *has not the force and weight of law*, what shall we say of the *Syllabus*, which was only communicated to the bishops by the secretary of state, Cardinal Antonelli, by the Pope's order. If the body of canon law is not an infallible document, much less can the *Syllabus* be so considered. Besides, to understand the meaning of each of the condemned propositions (and this takes away from the *Syllabus*, infallibility *per se*), recourse must be had to the source of each one of these propositions." To confirm these views, he quotes the words of Cardinals Newman, Lavigerie, Capececiatro, and Pecci (now Pope Leo XIII.) In the preface of the edition of the *Syllabus*, published by the Camera Apostolica of Rome, the authorized edition, we read: "Whoever wishes to find out the true sense in which these propositions have been condemned by pontifical authority, must examine the letters, encyclicals, and allocutions."

In the concluding chapter on Papal infallibility, *ex cathedra*, after quoting the words of Ballerini, *de Potes. Eccl.*, that it is "no wonder that true and certain pontifical definitions enjoying absolute infallibility are very rare," the author expresses this wish concerning the exercise of the gift of infallibility: "Obedient child of the Catholic Church as I am, full of respect for the ever-living magistracy of Peter, having in view the actual state of men's minds and impending changes, out of love for revealed truth and for just theological freedom, I humbly ask of the Sovereign Pontiffs that when, for the future they shall, in their prudence and wisdom, exercise their infallible authority, to make use of the actual words of the Council of the Vatican; that is to say, that they shall declare that they speak *ex cathedra*, and that they address all the faithful."

"If the words, *Transubstantiation*, *Matter*, *Form*, etc., have passed from the schools into conciliar definitions, it will not be an untimely novelty if the words, *ex cathedra* pass from the schools into the pontifical definitions; and the disciples of the Supreme Master will then recognize the authority which the same Master has given to his teaching" (pp. 122-3).

The author concludes his work in these words: "Behold the end of our work. These theological criteria, developed in positive and negative propositions, cannot, we think, beget any doubt as to their orthodoxy in the mind of any instructed Catholic; they will help to dissipate the prejudices of those non-Catholics who are seeking sincerely for the truth. By the light of these rules, we will appreciate the historical development of dogma, and we will recognize the large liberty of affirmation we enjoy in the domain of theology, as well as outside of that domain. May God guide us on our way."

Do we approve of the book? We confess candidly that many of our own conclusions are against those of the author. We do not believe in *minimizing* in matters of faith. It is one thing to say that such-and-such is *strictly de fide*, and another to assert that one is entirely free in all matters that are not strictly *de fide*, which is the conclusion that weak



human nature will draw from several of the propositions of the author. It is true, that for those who are outside of the Church the work may do great good, but we doubt whether it will work for edification to those who are of the household of the faith.

---

JOHN MCHALE, ARCHBISHOP OF TUAM. HIS LIFE, TIMES AND CORRESPONDENCE. By *Rt. Rev. Bernard O'Reilly, D.D.*; *D Lit.* Laval. Domestic Prelate of His Holiness. In two volumes. Fr. Pustet & Co; New York and Cincinnati. 1890.

This Life of John of Tuam, the Great Archbishop of the West, comprehends in its scope much more than its title expresses or even suggests to one who is not aware how closely interlinked he was with Ireland's history from the beginning of this century, and with all the events and movements, material, political, educational and ecclesiastical which have influenced, for weal or woe, the condition of the people of Ireland during this period of time. Born, as he was, in 1791, and possessed of rare intellectual gifts, which, under the influences that surrounded him, were quickly developed, he was an intelligent and deeply interested observer of the events of that memorable year for Ireland, 1798. From the lips of his parents, of his preceptors, and other intelligent persons with whom it was his good fortune to be associated, he drank in the tragic story of Ireland's wrongs; and, even in his boyhood, the sad condition of her people, the causes of that condition, and the true remedy for them, constantly occupied his thoughts; and from January, 1820, when he published the first of that memorable series of letters under the *nom de plume* of "Hierophilos," up to 1881, at first his fruitful, powerful pen; and, soon after, both voice and pen were employed unceasingly in, exposing the real sources of Ireland's miseries, the cruel exactions of Ireland's landlords, the bad faith and the crafty devices of British rulers to rob the people of Ireland of their religion, the subtle diplomacy and intrigues of the British government to mislead and delude the Holy See into conceding to that government the nomination of Irish bishops, or, failing in that, a *veto* on their appointment. During the most active and important part of Daniel O'Connell's career, the movement for the repeal of the union between Great Britain and Ireland, the Young Ireland movement, the controversy over the Charitable Bequests Act, the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, the Tithe Act Repeal, the Catholic Emancipation Bill, the struggle for freedom of Christian education, the opposition to infidel colleges; in short, of every important movement—religious, political, educational—to promote the true interests of the people of Ireland, it may with truth be said, that John of Tuam, for upward of sixty years, *magna pars fuit*; one of the most potent and conspicuous factors. Those sixty years of ceaseless activity on his part comprised a period of constant bitter conflict, involving questions of momentous importance to Ireland, and has never been exceeded in any country in the world in the intensity and persistence of the strife of mind with mind, or the far-reaching consequences involved in the struggle. There were giants on both sides; and among them all towered John of Tuam, conspicuous for quickness of perception, sagacity in detecting subtle plots and snares, for varied and profound learning, statesmanlike judgment, strength of intellect, power of argument, brilliant eloquence, undaunted courage, ardent patriotism, combined with unquenchable zeal for religion. Thus, when broadly considered, the life of Archbishop McHale, fitly styled the "Great Archbishop of the West," and also, with equal fitness, the "Lion of the Tribe of Judah," is the history of Ireland during the time in which he lived. "Born in

the penal days, he lived to see shackle after shackle struck away; and, mightiest and most trenchant of the strikers upon the galling irons of ascendancy in religion and rule—whether in the pulpit, the press or on the platform; whether in the professorial chair in Maynooth or on his episcopal throne—was John McHale. He saw three rebellions, a decade of land agitations, three famines, the tithe war, the struggle for emancipation, the war against proselytism, the great repeal movement, the stand-up fight between religion and godlessness, the national demand for home rule; and, from the ripening moment of his ardent and intellectual manhood to the last moment of his life, his hands, never wearied, were uplifted to the God of battles for blessings on, and in stout aid of, the cause of country and of creed. The anointed colleague of O'Connell; the foe of Derby, of Russell, and of Palmerston, the diary of this prince of the Church is the history of Ireland for the greater part of the century."

With broad and comprehensive views, such as we have just quoted from obituary notices of Archbishop McHale (some of them from the London *Times* and other journals that during his whole life were irreconcilably opposed to him and the measures he advocated), the author of the work before us undertook the congenial task of depicting in the two volumes before us the life and times of John McHale, Archbishop of Tuam. For the successful performance of this congenial task (for evidently it was a work of love) the author possessed rare advantages. He is thoroughly acquainted with the history of Ireland, with its people, of every rank and condition of life, and with the character and individual history and careers of all the distinguished personages whom the Great Archbishop of the West, on principle, lovingly and sagely counselled and mightily co-operated with; and also with those whose insidious schemes and measures this "MAN OF GOD," from devotion alike to country and the true religion, thoroughly exposed and resisted with all the power of his gigantic intellect and his heroic courage. In addition to these great advantages, the learned and indefatigable author has had free access to all the manuscripts and the treasures of the immense correspondence of Archbishop McHale, and the co-operation and assistance of his nephew and executor, the Very Rev. Thomas McHale, D.D., of the Irish College, at Paris.

That these great advantages have been turned to the best possible account it is needless to inform the many persons, in other countries as well as in this, who know or know of the distinguished author of these volumes. For this his well-earned reputation is an all-sufficient voucher. Nor is it necessary to say that his charming style befits his lofty, noble theme. The work is not only one of absorbing interest; it is simply invaluable to every one who would acquaint himself with the interior meaning and significance of the events which crowd Ireland's history during the present century down to this very day; and with Ireland's heroic contention for freedom, religious, educational, political and industrial; and with the profoundly important and far-reaching issues involved in the right and just solution of questions still pending between the people of Ireland and the British government.

Most gladly would we prolong this notice and mention in detail the important subjects elucidated in these volumes, but regard for limit of space forbids us.

As regards letter-press, paper and binding, their excellence well befits the value of the contents of the volumes. They are still further enriched by a number of admirably executed engravings: portraits of

Archbishop McHale, of Very Rev. Thomas McHale, D.D.; and pictures of holy places, shrines, abbeys, churches; and of the magnificent scenery of the West of Ireland in the midst of which John of Tuam so long lived, so devotedly labored, and so heroically, mightily fought for his God and for his *country*.

---

JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY. A Sketch of the Progress of Thought from Old Testament to New Testament. By *Crawford Howell Toy*, Professor in Harvard University. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1890.

"Judaism and Christianity" is a book fairly well written; it is in excellent type; the paper is very good, and the binding neat. Having said so much, we have said all the good that can be spoken of the work. We might, however, on second thought, add one more word of commendation, viz., that, in our humble opinion, the author is altogether too modest. The title he has chosen for his book is, we fear, rather misleading, and little calculated to bring prominently before men a correct notion of the wonderful intellectual treasures that lie within its pages. "A Sketch of the Progress of Thought from Old Testament to New Testament," is entirely too tame and unsuggestive a heading for a work so marvellous. How much more attractive would have been the following title: "Judaism and Christianity, from the Standpoint of a Rationalist," or, better still, "The Bible, under the Spencerian Microscope." At a glance, persons would then comprehend the high and pre-eminent nature of the work. The world would come to an early recognition of the author's greatness; and some fine morning, in the very adjacent future, he would have awoke to find himself famous.

But, seriously, would not either of our suggested titles have been more appropriate, and decidedly more truthful? For, under the smooth-sounding title of "A Sketch of the Progress of Thought from Old Testament to New Testament," the author has given us a book teeming with the most pronounced Rationalism. Professor Toy is a Rationalist. The calmness with which he sits in judgment upon the most sacred portions of Holy Scripture, and from its sacred pages not only eliminates every vestige of inspiration, but explains away every fact and doctrine, is astounding. Verily, hath learning made him mad. He has a yardstick by which everything must, and therefore can, be explained. What matters it that the whole world believes Christ to have been divine—that his miracles confirm it—that He, Himself, laid claim with his own lips to that high prerogative? Professor Toy, with all the pomp and ceremony that comes of conscious power, denies it. Professor Toy's great oracular theory does not so deliver itself; therefore, despite the world's belief, and the miracles of our Lord, and his own express claim to that title, Christ is not divine. Who says the death of Christ was in expiation of the sins of men? If our memory be not at fault, we have that doctrine from the lips of Christ Himself, which even our author admits in his reference to the words of Christ as handed down to us by St. Mark (c. x., v. 45); yet, on page 352 hear his reasoning:

"It is doubtful in what light He (Christ) looked on his own death—what significance He attached to it. The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah represents the death of the servant of Yahwe as vicarious and expiatory in the general sense that God accepts the life of his pure and perfect servant in lieu of the punishment which would naturally fall on his erring people. Such may have been the view of Jesus; such is the general meaning of his declaration (Mark x., 45) that He came to give his life a ransom for many. He had a lofty consciousness of power; he may have felt that the sacrifice of his life was an essential step toward the



establishment of his doctrine. But, it would be only in a general sense that we would regard his death expiatory—the sense in which suffering in general is looked on in the Old Testament as an atonement (as in Isaiah xl., 2) ; and from the meagreness of the data, we must remain in doubt as to the precise nature of this feeling. The saying quoted above is the only one given in the Gospel of Mark in which he refers to this point. In this connection, he is speaking only of service as the mark of greatness for his disciples ; and he adds, in order to set them an example, that He, Himself, came not to be ministered to, but to minister. The concluding clause, ‘and to give his life a ransom for many,’ is not quite in the line of the preceding remarks. It may have been uttered by him as the expression of the culmination of his ministry ; or it may have been added at a later time, when the belief in the expiatory character of his death had become fixed. No such view is hinted at in the sermon on the mount. If Jesus really said it [this in the face of his words in Mark x., 45—the reviewer], it did not belong to his earlier teaching, but was reached by his later reflection, called forth by the continually thickening dangers that surrounded him, and his prevision of his tragic end.”

From the above quotation, we have a sample of the author’s honesty and fair-dealing, and of the effrontery with which he tramples on every recognized law of interpretation. He has a mission to fulfil, and at whatever cost he will accomplish it. For preposterous assumption, for calm, deliberate, and unruffled self-contradiction, we have never before, nor do we hope soon again, to meet the author’s like. On one page, as for example, on page 423, we have him saying that never in thought or word did Christ claim for Himself divinity. By the way, how did our author come to a knowledge of the thoughts of Christ as distinguished from his words? On another page, as for example, on page 350, we have our learned author admitting that Christ—in answer to the high priest, asking Him if He did really lay claim to a divine character—did declare Himself to be divine, and the Son of the Most High. What are we to think of such contradictions? And these cited, are only instances, examples, of many others of equal importance. The book, in our opinion, and we feel that we but give expression to the opinion of all fair-minded critics, has not one redeeming feature—if we except a fairly good style and the work of the publishers. We know not if the author has attained honorable fame, but we feel convinced that the work we have examined will bring him none. One virtue we should ever find in an author, viz., honesty of purpose ; but, we are sorry to say, we cannot bring ourselves to believe that the author of “Judaism and Christianity” possesses that virtue.

---

SAYINGS OF CARDINAL NEWMAN. London : Burns & Oates. New York Catholic Publication Society.

Anything having relation to dear Dr. Newman must be most welcome to our readers. We have in this little book newspaper clippings of reports of his addresses and replies during the last forty years of his life. Some of them read almost like *verbatim* reports, and were on subjects of intense interest, such as : “On receiving a batch of converts,” “On receiving notice of his elevation to the Sacred College,” “On the relation between Catholics and Protestants in England,” “On the conversion of England,” “What a Cardinal ought to be.” We thank the editor for giving us this result of his loving care. As the publisher says : “They will be welcome to many. Nor is any apology needed at such a time for reprinting what is part and parcel of the history of the Church

in England during forty years." We think our readers will thank us for quoting "At the funeral of Henry Wilberforce" from the letter of one who was present at the funeral which took place at the Dominican Monastery at Woodchester in 1873.

"During the office a venerable figure came quietly up the aisle, and was going meekly to take a place on the chairs at the side; but H—— saw him and took him into the sacristy, whence he soon made his appearance in cassock and cotta in the choir, and was conducted to the Prior's stall, which was vacated for him. This was dear Dr. Newman. He followed the office with them, but after a while could contain his tears no longer, and buried his face in his handkerchief. At the end of Mass, Father Bertrand said something to Dr. Newman, and, after a little whispering, the venerable man was conducted to the pulpit. For some minutes, however, he was utterly incapable of speaking, and stood, his face covered with his hands, making vain efforts to master his emotion. I was quite afraid he would have to give it up. At last, however, after two or three attempts, he managed to steady his voice, and to tell us "that he knew him so intimately and loved him so much, that it was almost impossible for him to command himself sufficiently to do what he had been so unexpectedly asked to do—to bid his dear friend farewell. He had known him for fifty years, and though, no doubt, there were some there who knew his goodness better than he did, yet it seemed to him that none could mourn him more." Then he drew a little outline of his life—of the position of comfort and all "that this world calls good" in which he found himself, and of the prospect of advancement "if he had been an ambitious man." Then the word of the Lord came to him as it did to Abraham of old, to go forth from that pleasant home, and from his friends, and all he held dear, and to become"—here he fairly broke down again, but at last, lifting up his head, finished his sentence—"a fool for Christ's sake." Then he said that he now "committed him to the hands of his Saviour," and he reminded us of "the last hour, and dreadful judgment which awaited us all, but which his dear brother had safely passed through," and earnestly and sweetly prayed, "that every one there present might have a holy and happy death."

An admirable portrait of the great Cardinal, taken only a few weeks before his death, is the frontispiece of the book. It alone should induce every admirer of Cardinal Newman to purchase the little volume.

---

HISTORISCHES JAHRBUCH. Im Auftrage der Görres-Gesellschaft, herausgegeben von Dr. Hermann Grauert. xi Band 4 Heft München, 1890. Kommissions-Verlag von Herder & Ko.

This number finishes the eleventh year of the historical bibliography of the Görres Society. The work appears quarterly, in January, April, July and October, and gives almost a complete list of all historical works and studies that have appeared in the various languages of Europe during the quarter preceding, together with reviews of the more important.

The present number has two long articles, one on the "Discovery of a Treatise de Unitate et Trinitate Divina," which is supposed to have been written by the famous Abelard; the other on the "Existence of a Liber Papiensis." Then follow three shorter articles: (a) the works of Gerhard Zerbolt van Zutphen, *De libris Teutonicalibus*; (b) the cataloguing of the Vatican manuscripts; (c) Statistics of the Franciscans in 1493. After these follow two lengthy reviews of the "Correspondence of Blessed Rhenanus" and of the "List of Students of the University

of Rostock." The fourth part is taken up with a full list of historical serial publications, historical magazines and historical articles in other magazines of the various countries of Europe and America. The fifth part gives in 70 pages all works on history which have appeared during the last three months, philosophy of history, universal history, church history, political history, history of the various arts and sciences, and literature. The work concludes with information concerning the special labors of the members of the Görres Society in historical research. This analysis of this one number will show how valuable, nay, indispensable this publication is to the historical student, and that no historical society or public library should be without it. It is wonderful what an amount of information is condensed in its pages. We hope that this Jahrbuch will become better known to American readers; for we are sure, if once known, it will be appreciated as it deserves. Its price is \$3.00 a year for subscribers, and \$2.00 for members of the Society. The cover of the book calls attention to the publication of the 2d volume of the "History of the Catholic Church in Ireland," by Dr. A. Bellesheim, with a notice that the 3d and concluding volume is now in press. The learned author gathered his materials from the secret archives of the Vatican, from the Archives and libraries of Rome, the English archives and British Museum. The work forms a fitting companion to the same author's studies on the "History of the Catholic Church in Scotland," in two volumes. It is published by Franz Kirchheim, Mainz. First volume, 16 marks 60, about \$4.50. Second volume, \$3.75. The Blackwoods have published an English translation of Dr. Bellesheim's "History of the Catholic Church of Scotland," in four volumes. Father Hunt-Blair is the translator. We hope that they will be encouraged to do the same also for this "History of the Church in Ireland."

---

ORBIS TERRARUM CATHOLICUS, SIVE TOTIUS ECCLESIE CATHOLICÆ ET OCCIDENTIS ET ORIENTIS CONSPECTUS GEOGRAPHICUS ET STATISTICUS. O. Werner, S. J. Freiburg Brisgovie Herder, 1890. St. Louis.

"What a sublime sight 'it is to behold the west and the east, the whole Catholic world with its two hundred and thirty millions of souls differing in nationality and ritual, distributed hierarchically with dioceses, archdioceses, ecclesiastical provinces, patriarchates, all united most perfectly under one head?" These words of the learned and pains-taking author furnish us with the scope of his work. He gives the geography, brief historical data, and the statistics of every diocese in the Catholic world, not only those directly subject to the Pope, but also all those known as missionary, and, therefore, subject immediately to the Propaganda.

Judging from the historical notes given concerning the various provinces of the United States, the author has made a thorough search of the Jesuit archives in Rome. He furnishes the statistics of the Church in our land for the years 1830, 1842 and 1889. His authorities for the latest facts are Sadlier's and Hoffmann's Catholic Directories.

The *Missiones Catholicae*, published yearly by the Propaganda, give him the latest statistics of the missionary world.

As for the older dioceses, he tells us, he has made use of every trustworthy authority he could command.

At the end of the description of every province, he gives a map or plan, showing the evolution of the various dioceses from the parent root, with the date of the erection of each.

The result is a veritable encyclopædia, which, with the two atlases already published by him, should find a place in every library. The



general index gives the modern name and the Latin equivalent of every see and vicariate—an invaluable addition for every scholar. The publishing house of Herder—Freiburg and St. Louis, have brought out the work in a manner worthy of its high character.

---

THE CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD. A LIFE OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR, JESUS CHRIST. By the *Abbé Constant Foward*. Translated from the fifth edition, with the author's sanction, by *George F. X. Griffith*. With an Introduction by *Cardinal Manning*. In two volumes. New York and London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1891.

Received, as were the two volumes which make up this work, too late for writing a careful notice, and such a one as they merit, we now simply make mention of them, reserving what we shall have to say of them for the next number of the REVIEW. We only add, that when the work first appeared, it received the warm commendation of the late Cardinal de Bonnechose, Archbishop of Rouen. In 1881, Pope Leo XIII. sent his benediction to the author, and many cardinals and a large number of the bishops of France gave it their express approval.

---

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

IPSE, IPSA; IPSE, IPSA, IPSUM: Which? (The Latin various readings, Genesis iii., 15.) Controversial Letters in answer to the above question and in vindication of the Position assigned by the Catholic Church to the Ever-Blessed Mother of the World's Redeemer in the Divine Economy of Man's Salvation. In reply to the Right Rev. Dr. Kingdom, Coadjutor (Anglican) Bishop of Fredricktown, New Brunswick, and to others. By *Richard F. Quigley*, L.L.B., etc. Fr. Pustet & Co.: New York and Cincinnati.

EDWARD VI. AND THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. An Examination into its Origin and Early History. With an Appendix of Unpublished Documents. By *Francis Aidan Gasquet*, O.S.B., author of "Henry VIII. and English Monasteries," and by *Edmund Bishop*. John Hodges, Agar Street, London. 1890.

THE CHRISTIAN VIRGIN IN HER FAMILY AND IN THE WORLD; Her Virtues and Her Mission at the Present Time. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates. For sale by H. L. Kilner & Co., 103 S. Eleventh Street, Philadelphia.

MONUMENTA GERMANIÆ PÆDAGOGICA. Unter Mitwirkung einer Anzahl von Fachgelehrter herausgegeben von *Karl Kahrbach*. Band II., V., IX. Ratio Studiorum et Institutiones Scholasticæ Societatis Jesu, I., II., III. Berlin: A. Hofmann & Comp. 1887-90.

THE HEART OF ST. JANE FRANCES DE CHANTAL. Thoughts and Prayers compiled from the French by the Sisters of the Divine Compassion. With Preface by Right Rev. Thomas S. Preston, D.D., V.G., etc. Benziger Brothers.

THE DISAPPEARANCE OF JOHN LONGWORTHY. By *Maurice Francis Egan*. Notre Dame, Indiana: Office of the Ave Maria. 1890. For sale by H. L. Kilner & Co., Catholic Publishers, Philadelphia.

HOLY WISDOM, OR DIRECTIONS FOR THE PRAYERS OF CONTEMPLATION, etc. Written by the Ven. Father *F. Augustine Baker*, O.S.B., and arranged by R. F. Serenus Cressy, O.S.B. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates.

A NOVENA IN HONOR OF ST. CATHERINE DE RICCI, a Religious of the Third Order of St. Dominic. With a Preface by *Rev. J. O'Neill*, O. P. Benziger Brothers.

PSYCHOLOGY. By *Michael Mahr*, S. J. (Stonyhurst series of Catholic Manuals of Philosophy.) New York and Cincinnati: Benziger Brothers.

INDEX LECTIONUM QUÆ IN UNIVERSITATE FRIBURGENSIS, per menses hiemales anni, 1890-91, habebuntur: Friburgi Helvetiorum, typis Consociationis S. Pauli. 1890.









PERIODICAL

70749

**DOES NOT CIRCULATE**

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE  
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM



